

# THE MONTH

NOVEMBER, 1947

Vol. CLXXXIV EIGHTY-FOURTH YEAR

No. 964

## CONTENTS

COMMENTS.....	<i>By the Editor</i>	Page 193
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ST. JOHN DE BRITTO...	<i>By James Brodrick</i>	205
ELIZABETHAN ROYAL SUPREMACY AND CONTEMPORARY WRITERS .....	<i>By L. Hicks</i>	216
PILGRIMS TO CANTERBURY .....	<i>By H. W. R. Lillie</i>	229
THE MEANING OF RELIGIOUS LIFE .....	<i>By C Lattey</i>	235
MISCELLANEA .....		242
I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.		
The Marchioness of Lafayette.		
A Contemporary Dutch Stigmatica.		
II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES.		
REVIEWS .....		248
1.—(1) <i>Le Mystère Primordial: La Trinité dans sa vivante image.</i> By Taymans d'Eypernon, S.J. (2) <i>Le Saint Esprit en nous d'après les Pères Grecs.</i> By Paul Galtier, S.J. 2.— <i>The Real Shakespeare.</i> By William Bliss. 3.— <i>Totalitarian Climate.</i> By Max Pribilla, S.J. 4.— <i>Desire for God.</i> By Patrick K. Bastable. 5.— <i>The Dry Wood.</i> A novel by Caryll Houselander.		
SHORT NOTICES .....		215, 245, 254

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.

6 & 7 Clifford Street, London, W.1

EDITORIAL OFFICES:

114 Mount Street, London, W.1

MANAGER'S ADDRESS:

Manresa Press, Roehampton, S.W.15, to which Annual Subscriptions, 20s, post free (U.S.A. \$4.50), should be sent.

**TWO SHILLINGS NET**

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

# THE MONTH

A Catholic Review, conducted by the Jesuit Fathers, and edited from : 114 MOUNT STREET, LONDON, W.1.

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.  
6 & 7 Clifford Street, London, W.1

---

*THE MONTH* WAS FOUNDED IN 1864, and among its earliest contributors were Cardinal Wiseman and Cardinal Newman, Newman's well-known *Dream of Gerontius* first appeared in its pages. It is now in its 84th year.

IN JANUARY, 1947, IT RESUMED MONTHLY ISSUES, after the restrictions of the war years. There will be

## ELEVEN ISSUES EVERY YEAR

The July and August issues appearing together as one holiday number.

*THE MONTH* provides articles :—

ON **SPIRITUAL AND RELIGIOUS SUBJECTS.**  
**CATHOLIC THOUGHT.**  
**MODERN PROBLEMS AND THE**  
**BACKGROUND OF MODERN EVENTS.**

*Recent Contributors include the following :—*

Most Rev. T. Roberts, S.J. (Archbishop of Bombay), Fathers C. C. Martindale, R. H. J. Steuart, James Brodrick, Maurice Bévenot, Bernard Leeming, F. C. Copleston, Leo Hicks and John Murray, S.J.

*Also :*

Rt. Rev. Mgr. R. A. Knox, Christopher Dawson, Arnold Lunn, A. C. F. Beales and Halliday Sutherland.

---

## ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION

(From January, 1947) : £1 per annum (*eleven* numbers, post free).  
Individual numbers : Two Shillings each (plus postage).

---

*Orders and Subscriptions to :* THE MANAGER,  
MANRESA PRESS :: ROEHAMPTON :: LONDON, S.W.15

# THE MONTH

VOL. CLXXXIV

NOVEMBER, 1947

No. 964

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS

### Clearing the Ground

**W**HATEVER else has been done or not done during the autumn session of the United Nations Assembly, the ground has certainly been cleared. To some of us it was already evident how clear that ground really was. Now, it must be apparent to everybody. The United Nations Organization cannot function properly in its present form. Well over two years have elapsed since the close of hostilities, and still there is no peace—indeed no serious prospect of peace—with Germany; there is no peace treaty with Austria. One dispute after another has arisen, to be studied in due manner and according to the available international machinery, only to have report and solution rejected out of hand and from political motives of a complete transparency by Russia. The “veto” was introduced into the United Nations’ machinery, we were assured, to make that Organization more realistic and efficient, so that it might avoid the defects of the older League of Nations, which erred apparently on the side of idealism. In point of fact, the United Nations Organization has proved far less effective than the old League. Most of what it has attempted to do, has been sabotaged from within by the Russian veto. Further, it was to be established upon the unanimity of the Great Powers—a principle interpreted by the Russians as meaning that the remaining Great Powers must agree with Russia or Russia will see to it that, through disagreement and the veto, nothing is done at all. A deadlock has been arrived at, which most of the members of U.N.O., and in particular the United States, realise must be broken. It can be broken only by the abolition or the sharp restriction of the veto and by some short-circuiting of the ordinary methods of the Assembly and the Security Council in order to accelerate the settlement of Europe and the world. The realistic proposals put forward by General Marshall were intended to deal with both these issues.

The events of the past two years compel us to the conclusion that the Russian membership of the United Nations Organization is regarded by the Soviet Government more as a break upon that Organization than as a measure of collaboration in its work. The Russian delegates to Assembly and Security Council represent their government only too well upon this point. They are there to prevent,

not to facilitate action, to delay settlement and recovery, not to forward it. I am not suggesting that the non-Russian members are altruistic, and that Russia alone is egoistic. But those other members do want international co-operation and are ready to accept and encourage it on terms generally agreeable to the great majority, and on some basis of widely-recognized international law. Russia neither wants nor will accept such co-operation. She is there, in the first place, to block : that is, as an obstacle. Indeed, so clear is this—so definitely is Russia an obstacle—that the remaining Powers, those that is who are reasonably free and able to speak for their peoples, are now faced with the dilemma : Remove the obstacle, at the risk that Russia will leave the Organization ; Continue to put up with it, and resign yourselves to the futility of U.N.O.

### The Clash of Philosophies

**B**EHIND this entirely different attitude towards the United Nations Organization on the part of Russia and, to the other side, of the United States, Britain, France and most other countries, is a clash of *philosophies*. The Soviet Government has its own ideal of international order, and this, in the last resort, implies a system of Communist States linked together in dependence on Russia. This ideal—are we to term it an *objective*?—would involve the disappearance of governments like those of the United States, France and Britain, along with the social and economic systems of those countries. How far the men who control Soviet Russia seriously imagine they can realise this purpose, whether by secret interference or later by actual force of arms—that is unknown.

It might always be possible for other countries to collaborate with Soviet Russia for a short time and a strictly limited objective. And this, provided that the other countries were strong enough, singly or together, to resist the inevitable and unscrupulous Russian pressure. Such collaboration, however, could never be really genuine or sincere. The Russian intention of making use of every situation to Russia's revolutionary advantage would be an effective bar to that. It is pathetic to read in British papers expressions of disappointment that the Soviet Government will not co-operate with the United States and Britain. What excites our surprise is not this fact, but the long-cherished illusion that Russia ever would or could co-operate with ourselves and the Americans. Or we are asked to rediscover that "Allied unity" which "sustained us throughout the war." But, once again, in the sense which these writers speak, there never was this Allied unity. Russia fought her own war against Germany, once she was attacked by the Power which till then had been, for practical purposes, her partner and ally. She fought the same enemy as we were doing, and did so with great tenacity and courage. But there was little collaboration on the Russian side, and scarcely any attempt to bring home to the Russian people the extent and character of the assistance received from the



Allies. The process was nearly all *Take* on the Russian side, and mighty little *Give*. There were very few "Thank you's," and least of all in the Russian press. It was both foolish and unreal to stir up in Britain, as was done between 1941 and 1945, a wave of propaganda enthusiasm for Russia. It would have been far better, as well as more honourable and honest, to have told the truth about our relations with the Soviet Government. We would have been spared that nauseating nonsense about "Eastern democracy" and possibly spared the humiliating agreement of Yalta. The United Nations Organization might have escaped two years of shattered expectations and frustrated hopes.

Collaboration for some strictly defined purpose may be feasible. It is not so for any long-term purpose. Soviet Russia will not, and indeed cannot, work with or for the United Nations Organization. She will, in effect, either sabotage it from within, as she has been doing for nearly two years; or she will oppose it from without. Of the two unfortunate possibilities, it would probably be better for Russia to leave the United Nations Organization and remain outside of it. We would then know more clearly where we stood, and it would be possible then to build up a reformed and reconstructed Society of peoples, accepting a basis of principles and methods of international behaviour and law. Whether this isolation of Soviet Russia would increase the danger of war between Russia and the other Powers is not clear. Probably, it would lessen rather than increase the danger. There is more danger in attempting to agree, where no agreement can be reached, and deluding yourselves that you have agreed or will be able to agree in the future, than in facing the fact that no agreement at all, on any long-term consideration, is possible between Soviet Russia and the other Powers.

### This "East and West" Business

SOME protest ought to be made against the glib manner of Journalists in speaking of the impossibility of agreement between Russia and other countries as an incompatibility between "East" and "West." It is part of our modern practice of wrapping up realities in unreal language. What is this "East" they speak of? Not China or India or Japan, but just Russia. Certainly not the peoples of Eastern Europe, upon whom Soviet Russia has imposed puppet and pro-Soviet governments, but once again—just Russia. If we are honest, we shall declare that the incompatibility exists not between some mythical East and West but only and decidedly between Soviet Russia and the remainder of the world. Russian aims and policies are of such a sort that there is and must be a radical cleavage between Soviet Russia and other countries.

The peoples of East-Central Europe ought never to be referred to, even loosely, as forming part of this imaginary East. They are neither pro-Communist nor pro-Russian. After their experiences of Russian occupation and Communist experiment, they have far less

sympathy with Russia or with Communism than is perhaps entertained by sections in Italy and France and by parlour-Bolsheviks in Britain and the United States. We should in decency refrain from adding insult to injury in their case, that is, we should be careful not to increase the 'injury' of our present inability to help them by the 'insult' of a pretence that they are happy in their distress, and are gladly reconciling themselves to their terrible plight. If for the moment the Western countries cannot restore those peoples to their proper place in the life of Europe, they ought at least to remember, and very intensely, that these peoples are thoroughly European.

The facile division of Europe into two spheres of influence—one of which has in fact become a zone of occupation—should be relegated to the rubbish heap of past illusions, along with the pathetic belief that co-operation would not be at all difficult between the Western Powers and Russia. This artificial division of Europe has been the chief factor that has delayed European recovery and has frustrated all attempts to formulate peace treaties, and permit the European peoples those conditions of stability and security which are necessary if there is to be economic reconstruction and international peace. Every month that this division continues is a month lost to the cause of recovery, and may be a month nearer to some eventual Third World War. The erection of that division into a permanent barrier across the Continent would mean that the problems of Europe could not be solved, and would make that war a moral certainty.

The Marshall offer was made for the benefit of Europe. The countries under Soviet control were not permitted to take advantage of it. The offer can therefore relieve and assist only the sixteen countries to the North and West and South. It supposes that these countries will do their utmost in *self-help* and *mutual help*. But mutual help is most effective between countries whose economies are diversified and which are thus complementary to one another. Most of the East-Central European countries are complementary, in this sense, to the more industrialized Western European States. This is where mutual assistance is of the highest importance and—for the moment—where it cannot be achieved. For Europe is a unity, economic as well as cultural, and even, in a sense, political. These countries are part of Europe, and must be restored to full membership of Europe. This is a purpose which must be kept in mind, both within the United Nations Organization and by the governments and peoples of the Western countries. The economic restoration of Western Europe must be accompanied, or at least followed, by the restoration of Eastern Europe to the European fold.

### A New Comintern

THE recent announcement of the establishment in Belgrade of a Communist Information Centre, to co-ordinate the activities of the Communist parties of nine countries may once again have come

as a shock to those who considered that relations with Soviet Russia are the same as relations with other countries. In 1943 the Comintern was officially dissolved. That was a gesture made during the war. Whether it was anything beyond a gesture, whether the Comintern was in the slightest degree affected by its official dissolution, is another matter. Certainly, Igor Gouzenko, the Russian cipher clerk, who gave evidence before the Royal Commission, set up to investigate Russian spying in Canada, did not think so. His formal statements contained these paragraphs :

The announcement of the dissolution of the Comintern was, probably, the greatest farce of the Communists in recent years. Only the name was liquidated, with the object of reassuring public opinion in the democratic countries. Actually the Comintern exists and continues its work, because the Soviet leaders have never relinquished the idea of establishing a Communist dictatorship throughout the world.

To many Soviet people here abroad it is clear that the Communist Party in democratic countries has changed long ago, from a political party into an agency of the Soviet Government, into a fifth column in these countries to meet a war, into an instrument in the hands of the Soviet Government for creating artificial unrest, provocation, etc., etc.

No one imagines that the various Communist parties outside Russia are not carefully directed and co-ordinated from Moscow. But the creation of this new international Communist organ—the *Cominform*—brings out this fact in a much clearer and more challenging way. The inclusion of members of the French and Italian Communist parties is a direct threat—and intended to be such—to the political stability of France and Italy. It should be a warning to every country that any Communist party within its boundaries exists to serve the purposes of Soviet Russia, and for no other reason. Communism to-day has nothing to do with social redress or reform except that it will exploit grievances for its own purposes. It is concerned with power and with revolution. Its parties in different countries are there to carry out instructions from central headquarters, to act as their Russian masters decide they must.

It is time that the governments of democratic countries took more serious measures against Communists and Communist parties. It is idle to say that in Britain, for instance, the Communist Party is unimportant for no party can be unimportant, when it has a great Power behind it and when it exists to serve the purposes of that Power. Nor is it wise to say that the best manner of treating such a hostile group is to ignore it and that measures adopted against it might increase its strength. I am not suggesting that the ideal way of dealing with such a group is to outlaw it, to make it illegal ; though, in certain emergencies, that course would be necessary. What is needed is a campaign of education. Officials and members of Trade Unions, for example, should see that their fellow-members have no silly illusions about Communist parties, what their purpose is, and whom they represent. The Soviet Government has very

clumsily shown its hand in its proclamation about the *Cominform*, when it attacked Socialist and Labour Party leaders, like MM. Ramadier and Blum, and Mr. Attlee. A like educative process is needful in universities and institutes and training colleges.

### A South American Incident

ON October 6th, the Government of Chile expelled from Chilean territory M. Andrej Cunja, an official of the Yugoslav Legation in Santiago, and M. Dalibor Jakasa, secretary of the Yugoslav Legation in Buenos Aires. They were charged with interference in the coal strike in Chile and with acting as *agents provocateurs*. The Tito Government has broken off diplomatic relations with Chile—an event that has not bothered the Chileans who declare their lack of interest in maintaining relations “with the puppet government of Belgrade.” The Soviet Ambassador to Chile also left Santiago for Moscow after these events. The Communist parties in both Chile and the Argentine have denied the allegations.

The reactions of other South American governments to these events may be significant. Officials of the Argentine Government in Santiago are studying the details of this supposed Communist plot, and the local Chilean Trades Unions have condemned this Communist interference. The two principal Argentine newspapers—*Prensa* and *Nación*—have commented sternly on Communist activity. *La Epoca* (October 10th) spoke of Communist infiltration in the Trades Unions, demanded that the Communist Party be outlawed, and urged all working men to retain their unity. *Democracia*, for the same date, refers to Communist sabotage throughout Latin America; while the new Comintern is attacked in *El Diario* and *Los Principios*, a Catholic paper.

On October 11th both *Prensa* and *Nación* reported from Santiago a discussion of joint action by Chile and the Argentine against Communists. *La Epoca* again attacked them, calling for the deportation of all foreign members of the Party and the arrest of its leaders in the Argentine. One deputy has submitted a measure to the Chamber banning all Communist activities. Communists in the Argentine have retaliated with an appeal to nationalist sentiment and published a manifesto in favour of a united democratic front against “Anglo-Yankee expansion.”

It is, of course, nothing new that Soviet representatives—and here one must add representatives of Soviet-controlled countries—should make use of their diplomatic position for spying and interference in the affairs of other countries. The report of the Royal Commission on Russian spying in Canada showed conclusively that several high officials at the Soviet Embassy had organized spying on a considerable scale, and that the centre of this espionage was actually in the Embassy buildings. Once again, maybe, they have overreached themselves, and the Latin American States will adopt the severe attitude towards Communists and Communist parties



which has been adopted in the United States. They are conscious of the danger, and realise how much effort has been made by Russia to foster Communist agitation in South America. There is already talk of joint action between the Argentine, Brazil and Chile against Communism and Communists.

### South American Problems

THE Latin American countries are generally aware, as I have said above, of the threat of Communism. In few of them is there a long-established tradition of parliamentary government, and government changes have too frequently occurred through *coup d'états* and revolutions. Some of the countries are very poor; some have very serious social problems. All this could be exploited and presumably is being exploited by Soviet agents. There are factors, however, that are working steadily to remove this danger. In the first place, Latin America is Catholic in religion and culture, and whatever be the standard of religious observance in different States, there is no doubt that the Catholic spirit has penetrated deeply into the national and popular life. It is not merely a question of an official recognition of the Church by the secular authority or of relations between ecclesiastical and secular powers. It shows itself, in the Argentine for instance, by the great emphasis placed upon family life and the importance of the family in social relationships, as also by the fact that the Argentine Republic does not recognize divorce; in Brazil, by definite legislation which protects the family against break-up from within. In Latin America family life seems to have been far less affected by modern disintegrating factors than is the case in the United States or Britain. This is due, in part, to the *conservatism* of the Latin peoples of the New World (of the Spaniards in the South as of the French in Canada) and partly of course to the influence of Catholic teaching. The *conservatism* and the Catholic influence are naturally close to one another.

South American Catholics—so it has been frequently asserted—have been slow to understand the social teaching of the Popes and to interest themselves in social reform and development. In this there is some truth. Yet it should be remembered that the problems of Latin America are very different from those of Europe. It is an underpopulated continent, not overpopulated as are the countries of Western Europe. It has large areas that await development, great possibilities which could be and doubtless will be realised. It has not a large urban proletariat, and in the bigger cities of the larger States the conditions of the working classes are reasonably good. On the other hand, in Chile and Paraguay, for example, much poverty exists, and not a little demoralisation.

Interest in Catholic social teaching, as laid down in the Papal encyclicals, is growing fast. Earlier this year, a most successful Catholic Social Congress was organized and was attended by delegates from Central and South-Central States. As far as the Argentine

is concerned, there is wide Catholic encouragement and support for the considerable social changes which have been brought about during the past year and a half by the present Government. What Catholic criticism exists is not on that ground ; indeed, Catholics are sometimes accused of giving too generous and sweeping an approval to the new social policy.

The influence of the United States in South America remains all important. Not that these Southern countries are pro-American, in our meaning of that word. They are sometimes suspicious and always a little apprehensive. Yet, despite this, a pan-American sentiment is noticeable. The spirit of the Monroe Doctrine of more than a century back has been crystallised into definite agreements at the Rio conference of August, 1947. There is little doubt that the countries of North and South America would react together against any threat from outside, and that they would in the same way react against danger which might develop, with the assistance of Russia, from within. It is perfectly clear against which Power the agreements of that conference are directed.

### The Future of Germany

REVERTING to Europe, our minds are brought inevitably to the question of Germany's future. The next meeting of the four Foreign Ministers takes place in November. This question must then be faced. Relations between Russia and the other three Powers have become so strained, and the position of the countries been made so definite, that some decision must finally be taken. It may be that the Soviet Government will come to the conclusion that, for tactical purposes, it is better not to break with the other Powers, and in this case may be ready to make some concessions over the fate of Germany. Such a change of attitude is possible, though not very likely. Failing that change, the United States Government will insist that a treaty be made with a truncated Germany, composed of the three zones of occupation in the West. Each of the Foreign Ministers who will meet at London in November has declared categorically that a partition of Germany would lead to disastrous results. General Marshall, for instance, asserted in Moscow that such a partition would open the door to a rebirth of German nationalism ; M. Molotov pronounced a similar and not less emphatic warning.

Nor are the Western Powers unanimous in their approach to the German problem. The French, naturally and rightly, think in terms of French *security*, and want guarantees that a unified Germany will not once again endanger France. They demand an international régime for the Ruhr or at least international control, and they favour regional autonomy within Germany. Prussia has, technically, been abolished, but the Prussian spirit is not dealt with quite so easily. The Americans are anxious to have a Germany able to support itself economically, and to play its proper part in the recovery of Europe ; no doubt they also think of Germany as a bulwark against Communism



and Russia. The British Government, haunted by its own economic difficulties, wants freedom from the financial burden of the German occupation.

The British Government made it clear some time ago that Britain could not continue to shoulder the costs of half the administration of the Anglo-American zone of Germany but would have to ask the Government of the U.S.A. to take over the major portion, if not the whole, of this responsibility. When the two zones were fused it was hoped that their reorganization, and the gradual recovery which would ensue, might make it possible for the Germans to export goods to pay for some at least of their essential imports, the expense of which is borne by the occupying authorities. German exports have grown to a small extent, but so have the expenses of maintenance. The British Government is now seeking for relief, and that is the purpose of the governmental mission, under Sir William Strang, which has gone to Washington.

The Russian position it is less easy to disentangle. They demand reparations from Germany as a first condition of any treaty, but they have been helping themselves liberally to German assets and material in their zone of occupation. Apart from the dismantling of German plants which could directly serve warlike purposes—and this process is surely completed—it would be nonsensical to encourage the revival of German economy by any further destruction of German plant. They would like a united Germany, favourable to Russia and controlled, in effect, by some self-styled German *Einheitspartei*; but they must be quite convinced that such a hope is futile. The pointed attacks, in the Communist manifesto which accompanied the creation of the *Cominform*, on Socialist and Labour Party leaders, show that they have little expectation that the German Social Democrats, where they retain their liberty, will join with Communists.

In point of fact, the Russians have put themselves into a position, from which they may find it equally difficult to withdraw or make any advance. They have entrenched themselves in East-Central Europe. The shadow of their armies still hangs over the countries they once occupied or still occupy. Their puppet governments function, with their assistance, but definitely against the wishes and aspirations of those peoples. They are busy getting rid of Peasant and democratic parties and of political leaders like Mm. Petkov and Maniu, and trying to link the economies of these countries to that of Soviet Russia. They realise, however, that if they retire from these lands, so that these peoples recover their liberties, the puppet governments will be swept away before a fury of popular and national indignation. In other words, they have put themselves in a situation from which they do not know how to escape, supposing that they consider this possibility.

But what is true about Russia's position in these East-Central countries, is just as true in Eastern Germany. Do they want to get

out? Can they get out, and still retain the "advantages" they think they have secured from the occupation of a large part of Europe? Is Eastern Germany to be a Russian spearhead, thrust towards the heart of Europe, and marking the direction of Russian advance at some future date? Does the agitation of Communists, especially in Italy and France, preface a determined Soviet attempt to lay hold of those two countries, or is it rather a manoeuvre to bring further chaos to the West and to make the Western Powers ready to accept more compromises at the November meeting of the Foreign Ministers? It would be disastrous if Russia overestimated, as she well may, the strength of Communist parties in other countries, and their possible fifth column value in the event of war. The sands are running out. Russia has little time in which to persuade the other Powers that they can make a final effort to work with her, even for a strictly limited objective.

### The Treaty with Austria

FOR the last five months a Commission for the drafting of a peace treaty with Austria has been at work. During those months it held eighty-five meetings. In the course of these eighty-five meetings the Commission has not been able to agree on a common draft for a single one of the nineteen articles with which it had been entrusted by the Council of Foreign Ministers. This must be a record in diplomatic futility. Yet, comments the *Manchester Guardian* for October 16th, "the commission has not been such a wearisome failure as it seems, for every one of the four Powers concerned knows exactly where agreement can be reached, and how, if they are prepared to reach it." Eighty-five meetings, and no agreement over even one article—and we are assured that agreement could be reached, and the Powers know how. Is this tantamount to saying that, if the other Powers grant everything that Russia asks for, there could be unanimity?

The *Manchester Guardian* continued with the statement that the Russians fear and believe that Austria, left to herself, would move as far away from Russia and her satellites as she would dare, and that the influence Russia won on the strength of her victories and sacrifices in the war would quickly be reduced. On the other hand, Austria, weak, exhausted, resentful, and by no means certain of how to express her own identity, is unable herself to balance the forces of the East and West within her boundaries.

If such a commentary be not cynical, then what is it? Of course, Austria, left to herself, would draw away from Russia and the satellite States, in so far as those States tried to exert unfair pressure on Austria. Provided they behaved as States ought to behave to one another, relations could be free and normal. Austria, on regaining her independence, would exercise the privilege of independence and manage her own affairs. So indeed would the so-called satellite countries, *if left to themselves*.

The expression "influence won on the strength of her victories and sacrifices in the war" means—exactly what? That Russia, by reason of her victories, is entitled to behave as she pleases towards Austria and to prevent Austrian independence? And to continue to interfere in the internal affairs of all East-Central countries on the Continent? Such a pretension might have been put forward by the late Dr. Josef Goebbels, and it would have justified the Nazi treatment of continental peoples *as much or as little* as it can now serve to excuse the policy of Russia. It is sad to reflect that two years after the end of a war which, in the West at least, was a war of liberation from occupation and aggression, there is as much virtual occupation as ever, and the spirit of aggressiveness is just as evident.

As for the assumption that Austria should not be left to herself because of weakness and exhaustion, let the Austrians be judges. The chief barrier to their recovery is the presence of foreign troops, especially those of Russia. When it is suggested that the Austrians are uncertain about how to express their own identity: give them the opportunity of expressing it. They did so very effectively in their post-war elections, when, out of a total of some hundred and sixty elected deputies, they chose only four Communists. And more humbug has been written under the heading of that "division" or "balance" between East and West than on any modern subject except "democracy."

It is particularly painful and wicked that as yet no peace settlement has been made with the people of Austria. For, despite the existence of a proportion of Austrian Nazis, Austria was the first of the European countries to be *occupied* by the Nazis. It has proved possible to make a treaty with Italy, which entered the war under its own government and therefore on its own responsibility, and with Bulgaria, which at least chose the Nazi side. Austria ought to have been treated as a *liberated* country and restored at once to its proper independence.

### The Need for Moral Principles

THESE sad reflections on the state of Europe and the world bring us back inevitably to one conclusion. The world can never be brought back to stable conditions of existence until realities are faced and grasped. More than two years of wishful thinking have ended, as they had to end, in disillusionment. A half-hearted appeasement of Nazi Germany led up to the outbreak of war in 1939; it was bound to do so. But the men of Munich, so often condemned as the "appeasers," were stern-faced realists compared with the series of "appeasers" and "appeasements" from 1943 to 1947. Not one of these acts of appeasement has lightened the air for long or lessened the tension in the atmosphere. The air is more stifling, the atmosphere more charged with danger, than at any time since the conclusion of war. It is a gain, of course, that at long last realities are being faced, most clearly of all by the Government of the United States,

and that the Western attitude has grown more realistic. Realism, of this kind, is the only path which may lead to settlement and recovery and afford some security and peace.

But realism is not enough ; principles are called for. We have worked out methods for guaranteeing peace without securing the spirit in which peace can thrive. The unanimity of the great Powers, which lay at the basis of the United Nations Organization, would not have been sufficient for world peace unless there existed at the same time a foundation of unanimously accepted and sincerely respected principles. In the absence of these principles, all we have *de facto* realised is a unanimity in disagreement. We have perfected a method of making quite certain that nothing will be done because the unanimity, necessary for doing anything, is lacking.

The statesmen of the Western countries have a task at the moment which is highly delicate and fraught with perils. They must encourage order and arrive at settlements in the teeth of opposition, knowing full well that time is not, in every case, on their side, and that a delay in arriving at these settlements favours the forces which everywhere and powerfully are working for chaos and disintegration. They must work with a firmness that does not become aggression ; and, when occasion offers, with an elasticity that is not permitted to turn to weakness or appeasement. Theirs is an immensely difficult labour which calls for and should have the support and prayers of all serious and responsible men. But these statesmen, in their turn, must act on a basis of sound principle. "Unless the Lord build the house" and history has seen too many houses of cards, constructed precariously and for motives of expediency, soon come tumbling down. It is not procedure that is lacking. Men of good will can soon fix that. Principles have been lacking ; men have been concerned too little with what is right and wrong, and far too much with the supposed interests and problems of their countries. And if in the last resort it be objected that the Soviet Government recognizes no principles, then there is no chance that that Government will observe and respect your "unprincipled peace," which is all you imagine you can achieve.

The world looks for settlement and peace to the Western Powers. It is their responsibility to see that the world is not looking to them in vain, and this responsibility has never been so grave and significant as it is to-day. They must be strong enough not only to insist upon the actual conditions of this and the other settlement, but also to make quite explicit the moral foundation on which those settlements have been made, and must be maintained. The Powers that want peace and have the force to frame that peace must have also the courage to declare without hesitation or subterfuge what are the principles they accept and will defend, what are the standards by which they themselves and others are to act, and act together, in the cause of humanity, of right order, and of world peace.



## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ST. JOHN DE BRITTO

**I**N the year 1653, a Portuguese Jesuit, Father Balthazar da Costa, working in Southern India, wrote home to his brethren in the colleges of Coimbra and Evora with the purpose of attracting some of them to join him on his mission. The allurements which he dangled were of an unusual kind, but Portugal's heroic age had not yet drawn to an end, and he knew the spirit of the young men whom he was addressing. "First," he said, "let me tell you something about the climate. This is the torrid zone. The very air is on fire, and the rays reflected from the burning ground under your feet match in hotness those poured down on your head directly by the sun. When the atmosphere is calm, you stifle in it; when the wind rises it comes laden with all the heat of the sands it has traversed and burns you as would a jet of steam from a boiler. One journey in such conditions is enough to change a man's skin from head to foot. A missionary known to you has had the skin of his face and hands so often transformed that he no longer pays any attention to it. If the wind blows from the mountains it is not so hot, but very violent, and envelops you in clouds of dust from which there is no escape indoors or out of doors. The grit penetrates everywhere, even into the most tightly closed boxes. Owing to the heat, travel is impossible after nine or ten o'clock in the morning. Before then, you have to reckon with the heavy dews and mists, and if to escape them you set out at night, you will almost certainly fall into the hands of robbers. As for equipment, should you wear your wooden sandals, you will soon be leaving a trail of blood behind you on the sand, so comfortable is this style of footwear. Do I hear you say, Why, then, not go barefooted? On these red-hot sands, on this earth carpeted every square yard of it with thorns? The missionary I mentioned just now once set out on quite a short journey barefooted, about the distance of a musket shot. Before he had gone half way he seemed to be walking on live coals and by the time he reached his destination his feet were one mass of hideous blisters, while down his face poured the tears wrung from him willy-nilly by the torture. During the rainy season, which is the winter of this country, the heat is more tolerable, but travel is just as painful owing to the all-pervasive mud. It is one long agony pulling one's feet out of it, quite apart from the thorns acquired in the process. I have myself lost a toe-nail five or six times in the mud. As for the rivers and torrents to be crossed either by fording them with the water up to one's arm-pits, or by swimming them, or by improvising some sort of raft, I leave the matter to your imagination.

"So much for climate and travel in these parts. Is there anything else? Yes, our residences. These are mud cabins, possessed of a door but no windows, and thatched with straw or palm leaves. So cramped are they that it is almost impossible to move without hitting one's head against the lintel of the door or the rafters of the roof. Inside our houses, we carry on day and night an incessant struggle with the all-devouring white ants called *carias*, with snakes and a thousand varieties of venomous insects, with rats, and with the bats which infest our roofs. These bats are so aggressive that they gnaw your feet while you are asleep and even make away with the wick of your lighted lamp, thus presenting you with the risk of having the house burned about your ears. For bed we have a straw mat or tiger's skin spread on the ground. If you could find a plank to put between you and the damp earth, you would be sleeping in the lap of luxury. Our food is the least of our worries. It consists of a handful of rice cooked in water and seasoned with pepper. Sometimes we are able to add a few bitter herbs to the menu. Throw in a few vegetables, a little milk, and some melted butter (butter is always liquid out here), and you have our conception of a first-class dinner. It is the *ne plus ultra* of the brahmin missionary. We who are Pandara-Swamis<sup>1</sup> might strictly add a little meat to our diet, but our quality of penitents forbids it, for fear of scandal resulting, so we say with St. Paul, 'If meat scandalize my brother, I shall never eat flesh' (1 Cor., viii, 13). Anyhow, after a long course of the Indian diet, our stomachs wouldn't stand it.

"Is that all, then, that the missionary has to endure? Far from it, and we count it a trifle. God has given man a body capable of enduring hardships and sufferings beyond anything that could be imagined by those who have not experienced them. What I have told you is hard at the beginning, but gradually the body becomes inured to it, and soon you never give it a thought. More painful to bear and less easy to take in one's stride are the persecutions,

<sup>1</sup> On coming to Madura, the intellectual capital of Hinduism, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Father Robert de Nobili, S.J., had revolutionized missionary methods by adopting the dress, the dietary, and the civil usages of the Brahmins, the highest caste of Indians, who would have no truck with 'Pranguis,' as they called the despised and detested Portuguese. De Nobili made no attempt to conceal his European origin and openly declared himself to be a Roman rajah. But he severed all connections with Portuguese persons and customs, for only thus could he hope to win the literate classes to the faith. The cost to him in suffering was terrible, but his success was very great. Other Jesuits followed in his footsteps until gradually a band of brahmin missionaries became established in Madura. But there were many other castes besides the lordly Brahmins, and for these, too, provision had to be made, as de Nobili's men might not have any dealing with them on peril of losing their status among the Brahmins. Father Balthazar da Costa, who deserves to be remembered with the great de Nobili, was the pioneer in this matter. In some respects he even outshines de Nobili, for he was a Portuguese who threw over Portugal for the love of God and souls, whereas de Nobili was an Italian and would have found no especial difficulty in renouncing Portugal. The Pandaras, whose way of life he adopted, were a class of Hindu penitent less highly regarded than the brahmin sanniyassis, but with the advantage of being able to hold intercourse with the lower castes, as also with the pariahs or untouchables. He, too, had his followers, the greatest of whom was St. John de Britto. The two groups of Jesuits lived strictly separated, as the necessities of the case demanded, but de Nobili's genius and example was the inspiration of them both.



insults, contempt and opprobrium to which we are continually exposed in the midst of ruthless enemies, among a people the most degraded imaginable, and under a government that is nothing but tyranny and confusion. To have no place nor moment of security, to be unable to take with us on our journeys anything but such absolute necessities as our Breviaries, a few books of piety, and the essentials for saying Holy Mass : that is quite another style of cross. But the worst, the most harrowing suffering of the missionary arises from his solicitude for his neophytes, dispersed by persecution, despoiled of their goods, and delivered over to every kind of vexation and torture. Having sacrificed everything for their faith, they beg with tears for the comfort of Holy Communion, and we are too few to be able to satisfy them. Such, Reverend Fathers and dear Brothers, are the sufferings of a missionary. Knowing you, I am sure that my recital of them will not act as a deterrent. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

Father da Costa knew what he was about. His letter electrified his brethren and bred a spirit which came to its perfect flowering in the soul of John de Britto,<sup>2</sup> though he was only six years old when it was written. This present year of his canonization is the third centenary of his birth into one of the noblest families of Portugal. He was the fourth and last of the family, a frail and sickly child who came so near to dying at the age of eleven that his survival was attributed to the miraculous intervention of St. Francis Xavier. Ever after, that Saint shone as the brightest star in his firmament, dimming even his intense natural affections. His father and uncle had been foremost in the struggle for Portugal's independence after her sixty years' thralldom to Spain, and his elder brother Christobal was killed in the same great fight. Freedom won, the father was appointed Viceroy of Brazil, but died an exhausted warrior after only two years at that tropical post. His sons Francisco and John were then taken into the Royal household as pages to the infante, Dom Pedro, who afterwards succeeded to the throne. The Jesuits, in high favour at Court, had charge of the pages' education, and from them, good patriots though they were, John no doubt derived his enthusiasm for St. Francis Xavier. Francis, after all, was not properly a Spaniard but a Basque. Certainly, Francis and no other under God drew John into the Society of Jesus in 1662, just three months before his sixteenth birthday. Of his years as a Jesuit in training there is nothing to record except that his health remained persistently bad, and that he showed enough ability at his studies to be earmarked as a future professor of philosophy. One of his recent biographers has endeavoured to portray him as a

<sup>1</sup> Bertrand, *La Mission du Maduré d'après des Documents inédits*, t. iii, Paris, 1850, pp. 2-7.

<sup>2</sup> With the Revolution of 1910, Portugal revolutionized her system of spelling, which no longer indulges in double consonants except rr, ss, mm and nn. But St. John always wrote his name with a double t, and there is no reason why we in England should fall in orthographically with the robustious men of 1910 who expelled his brethren from Portugal and confiscated all their property.

gay and smiling saint, but that is not the impression given by the few crumbs of evidence available. Rather does he seem to have been markedly shy and reserved, a very quiet soul concentrated on a dream that had nothing whatever to do with Aristotle and all his company. Neither had it anything to do with the glory of Portugal, though the Portuguese of our time have elected to see him a "Hero of Faith and Empire." The authorities of the great little land even inscribed those words on the metal badges worn by pilgrims to John's canonization last June. If souls in beatitude can be amused, he must have laughed to see himself listed with the filibustering da Gamas, Cabrals and Albuquerque.

The crisis in St. John's life came with the arrival in Lisbon, in 1670, of the veteran Indian missionary, Father Balthazar da Costa, writer of the letter cited above. John, just about to be ordained, was the very first to answer his appeal for recruits. There followed a conflict of human love the most pitiable to be conceived. The Saint's mother, already twice bereaved, turned on the Lisbon Jesuits with something of the ferocity of a tigress at bay, but her son had already taken the precaution of appealing to a higher court. On March 5th, 1669, he had written a second time as follows to Father John Paul Oliva, General of the Jesuits in Rome: "I beg your Paternity to take in good part this renewal of my petition to you. So vehement is the desire which presses me day and night to go to India and devote myself to the salvation of souls that, did you not order me to the contrary, I would certainly write to you for the permission at every chance that offered. In a former letter I have already laid before your Paternity the reasons impelling me to ask this favour, and will not now repeat them for fear of sinning against the common good by taking up your valuable time with my arguments. The ardent zeal for souls which I love in your Paternity bids me hope for a favourable answer." The reasons of the earlier letter all turned on the beckoning of St. Francis Xavier: "I beg your Paternity with all possible earnestness to permit me to follow Xavier's call. I am always thinking that not satisfied with restoring me to health as a boy he is now opening before me the road to eternal salvation. By the wounds of Christ and the labours of St. Francis, and for the greater glory of God whose furtherance is nearest to your heart, I most earnestly entreat you to allow me to go to the Indian missions." St. Francis won and the permission was given. There was then nothing that the Portuguese Provincial could do to help St. John's distracted mother. From him she turned to her son's old friend, Dom Pedro, now King, but he had too much respect for the protégé of St. Francis Xavier to be willing to interfere. Then the poor mother appealed to the Papal Nuncio who upheld her until he had had a conversation with her son, whereupon he, too, gave in. As a last resort, the unhappy lady, hardly knowing what she was doing,

endeavoured to bribe the Provincial by the offer of a large sum of money if her son was kept in Portugal. What St. John himself suffered in this sad tussle of Eros and Agape is not recorded, except that he could not face a last meeting with his mother, and fled alone to his ship, the *Capitana*, on the eve of sailing, and from there sent her a letter containing his farewell. Twenty years later, she would emerge from lonely retirement at her castle of Portalegre, dressed as on the day she was married, to receive at the hands of the King her country's solemn felicitations on being the mother of a martyr.

The *Capitana*, with seventeen Jesuits for India on board, had a consort, the *Almiravia*, which contained eight others bound for China. The hardships of the six months' voyage may be estimated from the fact that of the seventeen men on the *Capitana* only eight reached India alive, while of the other group on the *Almiravia*, Father Prosper Intorcetta, the Italian superior and afterwards the first translator of the wisdom of Confucius into a Western tongue, was the sole survivor. Such tragedies happened almost every year that the little caravels of Portugal put out so bravely to sea. The number of Jesuits, all chosen men, who found watery graves will surprise us when the sea gives up her dead. The chief victim on this occasion was none other than the indomitable leader of the Indian band, Balthazar da Costa, who died in John de Britto's arms. John himself nearly suffered the same fate early in the voyage, but rallied to become in the most wonderful way doctor, nurse and pastor of the whole stricken ship. It is pleasant to record that in his tireless ministrations day and night he was most ably assisted by a Londoner of Protestant parentage who, on a business trip to Lisbon, had been received into the Catholic Church and into the Society of Jesus. Owing to the hostility of his family, he was obliged to conceal his name, and is known in Jesuit annals simply as Father Ignatius Xavier. He died in the Madura mission when only thirty-two, a victim of charity to the plague-stricken, pagan and Christian alike. Like his friend de Britto, and like de Britto's Irish novice-master, he was above mere narrow nationalism and a patriot only of Heaven.

More than a hundred years before de Britto's time, the great Portuguese poet, Camoens, who knew the place, compared Goa to Babylon, but to St. John it must have seemed more reminiscent of Sodom and Gomorrah, a hateful sink of colonial iniquity, for all its fine houses and golden fanes. The only magnet there for such a heart as his was the tomb of St. Francis Xavier, whose tired bones might have been so much more fittingly left to rest on the little Chinese island where he breathed out his great soul to God. Fearless as Xavier, St. John never hesitated to call a spade a spade in the Goan pulpits, with the result that after one particularly vigorous sermon he was savagely assaulted and left for dead by a group of miscreants.

who might have been executed had he not crawled to the court from his sick bed in order to intercede for them. He found comfort for his sad heart, as St. Francis had done, in loving attendance on lepers, galley-slaves, abandoned children, and other human flotsam and jetsam in which the "Rome of the East" abounded.

From Goa to the Malabar Coast, the jumping-off place for Madura, was then a ten days' voyage, diversified by the presence on the Arabian Sea of marauding Dutch Calvinists and Muslim pirates who would slit a Jesuit throat with the greatest pleasure in the world. After many tribulations John and seven companions reached the Jesuit settlement of Ambalakat between Calicut and Cochin, both places then in the power of the Dutch. At Ambalakat they were right in the midst of the famous and mysterious St. Thomas Christians who had been settled there for the best part of a millennium, converts originally in all likelihood, not of the Apostle as they still like to fancy, but of doughty Nestorian missionaries from Persia and Mesopotamia. In this new strange world Portuguese power meant nothing and the Portuguese name was held in hatred and derision. Here, St. John began determinedly to divest himself of his nationality, so far as that was in human power. Here, he devoted himself heart and soul to the study of the difficult Dravidian languages, especially Malayalam and Tamil, in which he had the *De Arte Tamulica* of Balthazar da Costa for a guide and many works of Robert de Nobili as texts. Here, he put away for good his black Jesuit cassock, donned a loose saffron gown and shawl, did his long hair in a knot at the top of his head and flung over it a turban, and finally fitted cheap earrings into his ears, previously pierced by a barber for the purpose. Here, in a word, the quondam page of the Royal House of Portugal made himself so like an Indian penitent that he was accepted as such by friend and foe indifferently, and even listed as a Sannyassi by the very man who condemned him to death.

Then, all being ready, St. John began his first missionary journey, four hundred miles of mountain, swamp and forest, from the Arabian Sea to the promised land of Madura on the Bay of Bengal. Since he was a novice at the game, with his feet still unhardened to the sands and thorns of India—though he had endeavoured, by walking barefooted up and down on pebbles, to render them a little sturdier—the kindly superior of Ambalakat offered him a horse for the journey, which naturally he declined, as Indian penitents were not in the habit of riding horses. But he had the great advantage of being accompanied by the old campaigner, Father Andrew Freire, for whom India held few remaining surprises, at least in the matter of suffering. Two years later, in 1676, the same Father Andrew wrote a brief account of their adventures to the General of the Jesuits: "We set out from Ambalakat in Apostolic fashion, with a couple of Brahmin Hindus as guides and bodyguard in case we were attacked



by the robbers who infest these mountains.<sup>1</sup> After a day of heavy walking we were drenched by torrential rain, which flooded the mountain streams and barred our passage at almost every step. As night was coming on, we were obliged to seek hospitality at the house of an eminent personage. Then had we to weather a new storm, a hail of questions the most trivial from a crowd of curious folk who kept us the best part of the night telling them our names and those of our parents, our place of residence and our destination, the number of our brothers and sisters, our business, whether we were married, and goodness knows how much else. At last they left us in peace, but without offering us so much as a handful of rice, probably because they had doubts about the nobility of our caste. They even thought they were doing us a favour by permitting us to lie down in the wretched vestibule of the house on the bare ground, hungry, wet through, and shivering with the cold.

"This was Father de Britto's first taste of life on the missions, but his courage was a match for it. Next day, before anyone was stirring, we fled the house and plunged into a vast forest, where, when the sun rose, we laid out our damp clothes to dry. Probably because they were ashamed of our company, our Brahmin guides caused us to waste much time that day, which we were obliged to make up by walking through the forest the whole of the following night, in danger of being devoured by tigers or bears, or trampled to death by elephants. Father John, unaccustomed to such locomotion, soon felt exhausted but struggled on bravely for about twenty-seven miles before admitting that he was beaten. Only then did I see the state of his legs, which were all swollen and covered with deep gashes. Bitterly deploring my negligence and small care for my dear travelling companion, I bade the guides halt, and we took a short rest. But there was still half of the journey to our first Christian station, Sattyamangalam, before us, and until we reached it there could be no real alleviation. Despite his weakness and suffering, Father de Britto desired to continue, because, as he said, 'the sight of the first Christians of Madura will be the best medicine for my wounds.' When we arrived at Sattyamangalam utterly exhausted, he did in fact wonderfully recover his spirits, but a little later fell ill of a disease that brought him to death's door. However, God was merciful to our missions and saved for them as by a miracle this worker of such brilliant promise. After a month of rest and convalescence, we continued our journey over mountains no less steep and wild than those we had already crossed. More than once we had to crawl up rocks on our hands and knees. At one place a whole family of tigers advanced on us at a few hundred yards' distance, and how we escaped their jaws I do not know, unless it was by the sign of the cross, our only weapon

<sup>1</sup> The western Ghats. Their poverty was their best protection, for they carried nothing at all except their staves and a few valueless Mass utensils.

and protection. At Dharmapuri we were welcomed with inexpressible charity by the Mysore missionaries, Fathers Ribeira and Mucciarelli,<sup>1</sup> and then pushed on to keep the feast of our Father, St. Ignatius, here at Kolei, in the midst of our beloved neophytes. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

Let us glance for a moment at the Saint on his first mission. The chief business, at the beginning, was to perfect himself in Tamil, which he did by writing, in the only way our Lord is known to have done, with his finger in the sand. Paper there was none. Next, he proceeded further to 'Indianize' himself by taking a new name and translating it into the new language. When asked what name he would like, he answered, John the Baptist, and in explanation put his fingers about his throat saying, "He must increase but I must decrease." After that, he was known to his dusky neophytes as Arulanandam. Following the shining example of Robert de Nobili, Arulanandam adapted Indian customs, whenever they were not patently idolatrous, to Christian uses. For instance, ashes derived from the dung of India's sacred animal, the cow, were and are held in high esteem by the common run of Hindus.<sup>3</sup> The Catholic Church, too, has her ashes, and de Britto felt justified, as he abundantly was, in turning every day into an Ash Wednesday in order to win the children of Siva and Vishnu to the worship of the true and only God. Again, Hindus had a rooted horror of being defiled by another person's saliva and of being breathed upon by another. St. John, again following in the footsteps of de Nobili, omitted, with the full sanction of his bishop, the two little symbolic ceremonies in the rite of Catholic baptism which involve saliva and insufflation. Such concessions were completely in the spirit of St. Paul with his Corinthians (1 Cor., iii, 2) and of St. Gregory the Great advising St. Augustine of Canterbury, but they brought upon de Nobili's head a storm of protest from honest theologians who knew as little about the Indian mind as about the other side of the moon. However, the Pope of the time upheld de Nobili and it was not until a hundred years later that other Popes banned the misnamed "Malabar Rites," after a controversy the most prolonged and acrid since the days of Arianism. It was a contributory cause of the Suppression of the Jesuits, as Clement XIV explicitly stated in his Bull, and a chief cause of the long delay in the beatification of John de Britto.

Meantime, St. John was enabled to be all things, doctor and nurse as much as priest, to his Indians, in order to gain them all. He

<sup>1</sup> He was an Italian Jesuit, later martyred by the Marathas, wild Hindu tribes who, under the inspired leadership of the freebooter Sivaji, conquered a considerable portion of India from the Muslims in the time of St. John de Britto.

<sup>2</sup> Bertrand, *La Mission du Maduré*, t. iii, pp. 253-5. Kolei was in the Kingdom of Gingi, a Hindu state under the sway of a Muslim vassal of the Great Mogul. By this time the Mogul had ceased to be great, and India, north and south, was in a condition of anarchy.

<sup>3</sup> This does not mean that cows have necessarily a good time in the sub-continent, as Katherine Mayo luridly proved in her *Mother India*, chapters xvii-xx.



became utterly one of themselves and took them to his heart with a love that no waywardness, hostility, or defection could ever weaken. The story of his ministry is one of almost superhuman activity in the vast areas infested with wild beasts and brigands, or the battlegrounds of contending rajahs, sultans, nyaks, poligars and other petty despots, where he was often the only priest. One hour, he is squatting cross-legged on the ground explaining the truths of the faith with infinite tact and tenderness to a group of tense, excited children, and the next, he is miles away at the bedside of some poor dying Indian. Of one such sick call he wrote: "Though the sores on my feet made it difficult for me to walk, God helped me so wonderfully that in a single night I covered a distance which would ordinarily have taken me two days, and I had the consolation of arriving just in time." The church and mission buildings which he had constructed single-handed according to the principles of Indian architecture at the isolated station of Tattuvanchery were swept away in 1677 by an inundation of the River Coleroon. Hearing of the disaster, which nearly cost the Saint his life, two kindly pagan chieftains who liked and esteemed the Christian sanniyassi offered him the hospitality of their houses and repaired the damage to his mission at their own expense.<sup>1</sup> Meantime, he set out for a great forest to the north, where in a clearing of the jungle called Kuttur he built another mission station. Then back to the hostile Coleroon, where during the Lent of 1678 he heard three thousand confessions and instructed and baptized six hundred converts. His journeyings henceforth, invariably on foot, are so many and complicated that it is barely possible to keep track of them. He is here, there, everywhere, and became such a notable swimmer of rivers that his Provincial, safe on the coast, reprimanded him, considering such methods of transit unworthy of the dignity of Portugal. Let him hire a coolie to carry him over or wait for a ferry. That Provincial understood very little of the divine impatience of the saints. During his twenty years in Madura, de Britto saw mission stations ravaged and ruined about eighty times, but he invariably built them up again, which

<sup>1</sup> St. John's personal account of the floods describes what happened when, after swimming or wading through the swirling waters, lacerated with thorns or sometimes impaled on bushes, he and eight of his converts reached the safety of a little wood which stood out like an island in an ocean: "The nine of us were crowded that night into a space of about six square feet, with masses of venomous snakes disputing our refuge. One of the Christians, a fine swimmer, rescued for us from the ruins of the mission a quantity of rice, but for two days and nights we were too busy fighting off the snakes, some of them huge creatures, to think of food. On the third day, a Sunday, I felt that something must be done if we were not to die of hunger, and plunged into the water up to my neck to collect some driftwood. My Christians followed, and eventually by dint of hard work we succeeded in lighting a fire and cooking the rice. It was the last week of Advent when the floods subsided and we were released. The mission was completely destroyed, but we constructed a little shack from the ruins, and in this celebrated the birth of the Saviour of the world. Our feast was in thorough conformity with the spirit of this adorable mystery, for our only decoration was our poverty. Happy at the chance, we united our privations with those of the Divine Babe of Bethlehem, and we did not lack privations, for in addition to the damp and the mud we were assailed by a biting wind from which there was no protection. . . ." (Bertrand, *La Mission du Maduré*, iii, 277-80).

shows that the divine patience of the Saints must also have been part of his panoply.

All this time, and indeed to the end of his days, St. John subsisted on a diet of boiled rice seasoned with herbs. Sometimes there might be a little milk but never anything else, so that, as Andrew Freire reported, the other Fathers marvelled he should keep alive at all, quite apart from the question of his chronic bad health and the killing burden of his labours. There is a quality of utter unobtrusiveness and selflessness about everything he did which is the clue to his character and achievement. His face alone was a benediction, and the pity of God hung upon his lips. It was by no signs or wonders that he converted his tens of thousands. If anything in that kind happened, he was quick to attribute it to the power of his guiding star, St. Francis Xavier. But just as much as Xavier, he was himself a walking miracle and never knew it.<sup>1</sup>

Like the Coleroon, this article has already overflowed its legitimate bounds and threatens to swamp the Editor, so it is necessary to come to an end without having told a tenth of the story.<sup>2</sup> After being hunted like any priest of Elizabethan England, St. John suffered in effect two martyrdoms. First, he was imprisoned and tortured at Tinnevelly towards the close of the year 1684, and then arrested a second time in Marava two years later, pitilessly scourged, beaten about the face, racked, stretched naked on a rock and trampled upon by eight men, and finally condemned to be hacked to pieces. But the end was not to be yet and seven years more of white martyrdom remained to this great yogi of Christ before, on February 4th, 1693, at a point of the coast looking towards Ceylon, he meekly bowed his head to the scimitar which united him with St. Francis Xavier. In his life he had dotted the i's and crossed the t's of Father da Costa's letter with which we began, and added several postscripts of sorrow and splendour to it entirely his own. De Nobili and he were centuries ahead of their period and, like all great pioneers, had to suffer the consequences of their apostolic daring. Many years after they were dead, the critics of their policy, including even some Jesuits, won the day, and their missionary methods fell under the condemnation of the Holy See as did those of Matteo Ricci in China. For length and bitterness, the controversy on the mis-called Malabar Rites and the Chinese Rites has hardly its equal in Church history except the

<sup>1</sup> Once, after a gruelling expedition to several of his missions, he collapsed with a terrible fever. "I felt as if I were being burned alive," he said. "My feet were covered with poisonous boils, and my eyes got some infection that gave me violent pain. The doctor could make nothing of the case and gave me up for lost. After ten days of torment God inspired me to have recourse to the intercession of St. Francis Xavier. Taking him on his weak side, I renewed in his honour the vow to consecrate myself to my last breath to the conversion of his dear Indians. At that moment my sufferings abated and in a few days I was completely cured" (Bertrand, l.c., p. 321).

<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, there is no really satisfactory life of the Saint, the Portuguese ones being too imperialistic for English taste, and the ones written in India too romantic or sentimental. The best portrait is still to be found in Bertrand's old volumes.

age-long contention over Arianism. But now, in the unhurrying providence of God, John de Britto, with his halo about him, emerges as the victor, for the system of adaptation which he and de Nobili sponsored is becoming in ever-increasing measure the official system of the Catholic Church. That is part of the significance of St. John for our time, but even more to the point is the spirit of the man himself, his genius for building anew on the ruins of his past endeavours.

JAMES BRODRICK.

---

---

### SHORT NOTICE

The Preface of *Twelve and After* (by Rev. F. H. Drinkwater, Editor of *The Sower*. Samuel Walker, Ltd., London: pp. xii, 131. 5s.) anticipates the only adverse criticism we might have made—that the material expects too much of the children: but the book was published in 1924 and has been so often asked for again, that the title is left unchanged. It provides—not ‘model lessons’, but *material* which teachers will arrange and manipulate as they feel best. It recalls to us two incidents: we once had to write to a school whose scripture papers we had to examine, that the children had no idea how to tackle a question. “What do you know of St. Peter from the *Acts*?” “St. Peter, who became first bishop of Rome and was crucified head downwards, saw a vision of a sheet. . . . He baptised Cornelius who was not a Jew, showing that . . . St. Paul afterwards said he rebuked him, though he did not really do so. . . .” Our explanation—*why* this was not what was wanted was received with no enthusiasm. Since the book contains many quotations from the Scriptures, it was very wise to insist that ‘texts’ must be explained in their *context*. This really involves the teaching of our Lord’s Life as a ‘life lived’ and not a collection of ‘apologetic’ sayings nor of pegs to hang pious coats on. Again, we once set the *O Salutaris* to the top class but one of a big school as an Unseen. Two boys translated ‘Hostia’ as ‘enemy’—when we said: “What *can* that mean?” we found that it had never occurred to them that the Latin meant something, nor even that Cicero, to quote a pagan, talked sense. Several others translated the word as ‘host’, i.e. the inviter of guests. How wise, then, is the warning (p. 105) to make sure that what is said (or sung) means something, and if so, what. When the Liturgy is concerned, again the emphasis is on *what* is happening and *why*. We are very glad that much history is introduced (e.g. in the explanation of Indulgences, past errors in method of preaching them, and even scandals, not being disguised). And the author often brings his explanation right down to the present day, providing a continuous perspective, and avoiding the idea that ‘history’ is concerned only with what happened ‘long ago’. This sober note does not express more than a minimum of our gratitude and admiration for the—we say it deliberately—unique work that Fr. Drinkwater has been doing for many years. If we are so anxious to preserve our schools, we must make absolutely sure that they are worth preserving. This is the more certain now that the school-leaving age is being raised and more and better teachers will be needed.

## ELIZABETHAN ROYAL SUPREMACY AND CONTEMPORARY WRITERS

THE Oath of Supremacy, incorporated in the first statute of Elizabeth, while repudiating all ecclesiastical or spiritual authority of any foreign prince or prelate, declared the queen to be "the only supreme governor" of the realm as well in spiritual as in temporal causes. This substitution, however, of the title 'supreme governor' for that of 'supreme head' adopted by her father, implied no diminution in the extent of the supremacy claimed by the queen.<sup>1</sup> The Act, indeed, was interpreted by the contemporary judges and lawyers, not as introducing new law, but merely as declaratory of the old, of that ancient jurisdiction which, it was boldly but falsely asserted, had always belonged to the crown of England.

What, then, it may be asked, was the reason for the alteration in the title? Professor Black suggests that the change was made to conciliate the Catholics.<sup>2</sup> This, however, was not the opinion of the contemporary Catholic exiles who had witnessed the change of religion. According to them the alteration was a ruse or trick to disguise the extent and reality of the supremacy not so much from the Catholics as from the Protestant opponents to it, and so induce them to accept it. The Jesuit, Persons, for instance, wrote of the alteration thus: "When Henry the Eighth had taken the title of Supreme Head of the Church upon him, as also the governors of King Edward had given the same unto him, being but yet a child of nine years old, the Protestants of other countries, which were glad to see England break more and more from the Pope, whom they feared; yet not willing instead thereof to put themselves wholly under temporal princes, but rather to rest at their own liberty, of choosing congregations and presbyteries, to govern; began to mislike with this English title of Supreme Head, as well the Lutherans, as appeareth by divers of their writings, as also the Zwinglians, and much more the Calvinists, whereupon John Calvin their head and founder, in his Commentary upon Amos, the Prophet, inveigheth bitterly against the title and authority of Supreme Head taken first by King Henry, and saith it was tyrannical and impious. And the same assertion he held during life, as after by occasion more particularly shall be shewed. And the whole body of Calvinists throughout other countries, are of the same opinion and faith, though in England, they be upon this point divided into Protestants and Puritans, as all men know.

"This then being the state of things, when Queen Elizabeth began

<sup>1</sup> This point has been explicitly treated by the writer in *The Ecclesiastical Supremacy of Queen Elizabeth*, *The Month*, March, 1947.

<sup>2</sup> *The Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, Oxford, 1936, pp. 14, 15.



her reign, those that were nearest about her, and more prevailed in counsel, inclining to have a change in religion, that thereby also other changes of dignities, offices and livings might ensue, and desiring to reduce all to the Queen's disposition; but yet finding great difficulty and resistance in many of the Calvinists, to give the accustomed title of headship, in respect of John Calvin's reprobation thereof: they devised a new form and feature of words, whereby covertly to give the substance without the name: that is to say, the whole spiritual power and jurisdiction of Supreme Head under the name of Visitrix, or Supreme Governesse, as in the oath of the same statute is set down, where every man, under forfeiture of all his lands and livings (and life also in the third time) is bound to swear, and profess, that he believeth in his conscience that the said Queen is supreme governess in all causes ecclesiastical in this sense; and that there is no other spiritual Power or ecclesiastical jurisdiction over souls in England, but this of the Queen, or such as cometh from her."<sup>1</sup> Persons further suggests that there were scruples about taking the title of Supreme Head in the mind of Elizabeth herself, "who (besides the other reason of Calvinists' mislike and reprehension thereof, before mentioned in Henry the Eighth) had little opinion or appetite of the matter in those days, not being ignorant, (for she was of excellent wit) how strange a thing it would seem to the world, to have one of her sex supreme in sacred and ecclesiastical matters, in iis quae sunt ad Deum, to use St. Paul's words, in this case, that is to say, in those things, that are to be handled with God for man, or between God and man."<sup>2</sup>

All this agrees well with what Sandys wrote to Matthew Parker in April, 1559: "Mr. Lever wisely put such a scruple in the Queen's head that she would not take the title of Supreme Head," and with other similar statements on the part of Protestants.<sup>3</sup> It is also in accord with the reiterated statement of the Count of Feria who had just lately relinquished the post of Spanish Ambassador in England and was still living in London.<sup>4</sup>

The ruse is rendered more intelligible by a fact which historians of the Elizabethan régime have failed to emphasise, and indeed, one might say, passed over in complete silence, but which the Catholic exiles frequently brought forward, the fact that on the Continent

<sup>1</sup> Persons, *An Answer to the Fifth Part of Reportes lately set forth by Sir Edward Cooke*, 1606, pp. 58, 59. Cf. also W. Allen, *A Sincere and Modest Defence* (1584), ed. 1914, Vol. 1, p. 17; Sanders (English Trans. Lewis), *The Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, p. 245; R. Bristow, *Treatise of Divers Plaine and Sure Waies to find out the Truth*, Antwerp, 1599, ff. 76v-79v.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 362.

<sup>3</sup> Sandys to Parker, 30 April, 1559, cited in Burnet's *History of the Reformation* (ed. Pocock), Vol. V, p. 505. Cf. also Jewel to Peter Martyr, s.d.; Parkhurst to Bullinger, 21 May, 1559; Jewel to Bullinger, 22 May, 1559, in *Zurich Letters*, Parker Society, Vol. I, pp. 24, 29, 33.

<sup>4</sup> Feria to Philip II, 19 March, 24 March, 11 April and 18 April, 1559, *Spanish Calendar*, pp. 37, 43, 52 and 55. C. Hallowell Garrett appears to be the only modern historian who has emphasized the opposition in 1559 to the Supremacy on the part of English Protestants. Cf. *The Marian Exiles*, Cambridge, 1938, Preface.

Protestant systems and Protestant leaders, particularly at Geneva, whither many of the English fugitives under Mary had fled, by no means allowed to the lay or civil power supreme jurisdiction in ecclesiastical causes, and that, consequently, in this matter of supremacy, and still more in giving the sovereign the title of Supreme Head, English Protestantism was *unique*.<sup>1</sup> In the very year 1558, but before Elizabeth had ascended the throne, three English works were published at Geneva, containing statements quite at variance with the supremacy so soon to be conferred on the queen. In his *Admonition to England and Scotland*, after referring to the iniquities of Henry VIII, Anthony Gilbert wrote: "This monstrous boar for all this, must needs be called the Head of the Church in pain of treason, displacing Christ our only head, who alone ought to have this title. Wherefore in this point, O England, ye were no better than the Romish Antichrist, who by the same title maketh himself a God, and sitteth in men's consciences, banisheth the word of God, as did your King Henry, whom ye so magnify. For in his best time, nothing was heard but the King's booke, the King's proceedings, the King's homilies in the Churches, where God's word only should have been preached. So made you your king a God, believing nothing but that he allowed. I will not for shame name how he turned to his wont: I will not write your other wickedness of those times; your murders without measure, adulteries and incests of your king, and his lords and commons."<sup>2</sup> Granted that Gilby, as a good Calvinist, objected to Henry's retention of Catholic doctrine in other points, there is no mistaking his opposition to the ecclesiastical supremacy of the king; nor is there any mistaking of the parallel between Henry VIII and Elizabeth with her royal Injunctions, her royal Advertisements, and the like.

Annexed to Gilby's work was Knox's *Appeal to the Commonalty*, wherein he expressed opinions altogether incompatible with the Elizabethan supremacy; and in that same year, 1558, he published his *First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous regiment of Women*, in which he declared that the rule of women even in temporal concerns was contrary to nature and the word of God.<sup>3</sup> Much about

<sup>1</sup> "A singular point of doctrine proper (i.e. peculiar) to England above all nations." Persons, *A Treatise of Three Conversions of England*, 1603, Vol. I, Part II, p. 626. The following works of Catholic exiles emphasize this point of singularity: T. Stapleton, *Counterblast*, ff. 22v-26, and 502-510; *A Fortress of the Faith*, St. Omer, 1625, pp. 380-382; W. Allen, *An Apologie and True Declaration*, 1581, f. 42v; R. Persons, *Philopater*, 1583, 306, 311; Warnword, 1602, p. 51; *An Answer to the Fifth Part of Reportes*, etc., 1606, pp. 58, 59, and 87-90; T. Fitzherbert, *Apologie*, 1602, f. 42v; R. Smith, *An Answer to Thomas Bels late Challeng*, Douay, 1605, ff. 10 ff.

<sup>2</sup> An *Admonition to England and Scotland*, Geneva, 1558. The passage is quoted in Stapleton's *Counterblast*, f. 23v, and referred to by Persons in his *Philopater*, p. 311, and by other contemporary Catholic authors.

<sup>3</sup> Knox's book, of course, was directed against the Queen Regent of Scotland, Mary of Guise, and against Mary Tudor, who at the time was still reigning in England. On the accession of Elizabeth, so soon after the appearance of the book, Knox felt the position a little difficult and awkward. His way of getting out of it, even if it does not carry conviction, has certainly the merit of ingenuity. Whilst not retracting his former statements—



the same time there appeared also from the Genevan press Goodman's *How Superior Powers ought to be obeyed*, which contained the same thesis as that of Knox, viz. that "the government of women is against nature and God's ordinance."<sup>1</sup> Nor in this was Goodman stating merely his own individual opinion; for in his preface to the same book Whittingham wrote: "Master Goodman conferred his articles and chief propositions with the best learned in these parts, who approved them; he consented to enlarge the said sermon and to print it as a token of his duty and good affection towards the Church of God. And then it was thought good to the judgment of the godly, to translate the same into other languages, that the profit thereof might be universal."<sup>2</sup>

Continental Protestants, too, showed their disapproval of the Supremacy involved in the Elizabethan ecclesiastical régime. In reply to Horne, the Protestant Bishop of Winchester, Stapleton cited Calvin's denunciation of ascribing such authority to the civil power. "The words of John Calvin," he wrote, "be manifest, and cannot be avoided. He saith: Erant blasphemii, cum vocarent ipsum Summum Caput Ecclesiae sub Christo. They were blasphemous, when they called him (he meaneth Henry VIII) the Supreme Head of the Church under Christ."<sup>3</sup> Stapleton emphasises this repudiation of ascribing to the temporal power ecclesiastical authority by another quotation from the same commentary. "But in the meanwhile," wrote Calvin, "there are unadvised persons, which do make them (he meaneth the lay princes) too spiritual. And this oversight reigneth most in Germany. In these countries also it proceedeth overmuch. And so we feel what fruits spring up of that root: verily that Princes and all such as bear rule, think themselves now so spiritual, that there is no more any Ecclesiastical

such would have been a too rapid conversion—he wrote to Cecil: "If Queen Elizabeth shall confess that the extraordinary dispensation of God's mercy makes that lawful in her which both nature and God's law deny to all women, none in England shall be more willing to maintain her authority than himself; but if she grounds her title upon the customs, laws, or ordinances of men, then he is assured that as such foolish presumption highly offends God's majesty, so does he greatly fear that her ingratitude shall not lack punishment." (Knox to Cecil, 10 April, 1559, *Cal. Dom. Eliz.*, p. 209.) Cecil was not convinced, and refused Knox the passage he asked for through England. Nor could Cecil consistently have done otherwise. Elizabeth's position was not to be based on extraordinary dispensation of God's mercy in her particular case—a rather frail and unenduring foundation at the best—but on what was asserted to be "the ancient law and prerogative of England."

<sup>1</sup> *How Superior Powers ought to be obeyed*, Geneva, 1558, p. 53. Cf. also, pp. 30, 96 and 139.

<sup>2</sup> Neither Gilby nor Goodman were prevented by their writings and opinions from being appointed to and accepting livings in the Anglican Church under Elizabeth. Both, however, continued to work against the established religion in favour of the Puritans. Matthew Parker ordered Gilby to be prosecuted for non-conformity, but Grindal, the Bishop of London, partly out of a certain sympathy with his views and probably, too, out of fear of Gilby's powerful patron, the Earl of Huntingdon, did not carry out the order, and the Puritan remained in possession of his living until his death in 1585. On the later opinions of the Puritans, cf. Strype, *Annals* IV, n. XCIV, p. 197.

<sup>3</sup> Stapleton, *Counterblast*, f. 506. The passage of Calvin to which he refers is in his *Commentary on the prophet Amos*. "Qui initio . . . zelo." Cf. *Joannis Calvini Magni Theologi Praelectiones in Librum Propheticum Danielis necnon in Duodecim Prophetas Minores*, Amsterdam, 1667, p. 223.

government. And this sacrilege taketh place among them, because they cannot measure their office within certain and lawful bounds, but are persuaded, that their kingdom is nothing except they abolish all authority of the Church, and become themselves the supreme judges as well in doctrine, as in all kinds of spiritual government." This, let it be noted, was no mere obiter dictum of Calvin: the same opinion is to be found in his *Institutes*, and Stapleton cites from that work a passage, the argument of which was also at times brought forward by Catholic apologists. "When Emperors and Magistrates," wrote Calvin, "began to profess Christ, the spiritual jurisdiction was not by and by abolished, but so ordered that it should diminish nothing of the civil jurisdiction or be confounded with it. And rightfully. For the magistrate, if he be godly, will not exempt himself from the common subjection of the children of God. So far is it off that he ought to take the order of judgment. For what is more honourable (saith Ambrose), for the Emperor, than to be called the son of the Church? For a good Emperor is within the Church, not above the Church. Therefore they, which to honour the magistrate, do spoil the Church of this power, do not only with false exposition corrupt the sentence of Christ, but also do not slenderly condemn holy bishops, which have been from the time of the Apostles, that they have by false pretences usurped the honour and office of the magistrate."<sup>1</sup>

In the controversy between Feckenham, Abbot of Westminster, and Horne, these same passages were cited by the former as showing Calvin to be opposed to the Supremacy attributed to Elizabeth. Horne's reply that Calvin's Latin was too fine for Feckenham's gross understanding was hardly effective. The fact is that Calvin's principles can by no means be made to agree with the Elizabethan Supremacy, as both the followers of Calvin in England, the Puritans, and their opponents more and more realised as the reign proceeded.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Stapleton, *Counterblast*, ff. 501 ff.; *A Fortresse of the Faith*, pp. 380, 381. The passage is to be found in Calvin's *Institutes*, Amsterdam, 1667, Bk. IV, c. XI, § 4, p. 325. Further pertinent passages cited by Catholic exiles are *Institutes*, Bk. IV, c. XI, § 15, and his letter to Myconius, 14 March, 1542. Cf. also Calvin to Myconius, 10 February, 1542; *Opera*, Amsterdam, 1667, pp. 17 and 14. Cf. also Persons, *Philopater*, pp. 306, 307, and his *Answer to the Fifth Part of the Reportes*, p. 87. The exiles also refer to Beza, *Confessiones Ecclesiae Genevensis* and *De Presbyteratu*, and to the *Three Dialogues* of Pierre Viret, the friend and co-worker of Calvin. Cf. Persons, op. cit. *ibid.* The argument used by Calvin is developed more powerfully in W. Allen, *An Apologie and True Declaration*, ff. 38v-47v, and in Persons, *An Answer to the Fifth Part of the Reportes*, pp. 32-46. For Calvin's political views, see J. W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, London, 1928, pp. 48-72.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *A treatise of Ecclesiastical Discipline*, 1590, and *A Survey of the Holy Pretended Discipline* 1591, by M. Sutcliffe, the Dean of Exeter, and *Dangerous Positions*, 1592, by R. Bancroft, later Archbishop of Canterbury. These three books were written to show that Puritan principles are contrary to the royal supremacy. In the dedicatory letter of the first work, addressed to the Earl of Bath, Sutcliffe writes: "If it be lawful for them to deny the prince's supreme authority in ecclesiastical causes, and to revel at laws and government, I trust my speech for the prince's authority and lawful government against the encroachments of the new lordlings of the Consistory may have favourable audience." Persons in his *Three Conversions*, vol. II, part II, pp. 145 ff., refers to the last two works to show that the Puritans were opposed to the supremacy. Cf. also his *Answer to the Fifth Part of the Reportes*, p. 75.

But, as the Catholic exiles pointed out, it was not only the Calvinists whose principles ran counter to the supremacy; Lutherans also were opposed to it. In his *Counterblast* Stapleton addressed his antagonist, Horne: "Answer to the zealous Lutherans, and to the famous liers of Magdeburg, who in their preface upon the seventh century, complain so bitterly, that the lay magistrates will be *heads of the Church, will determine doctrine and appoint to the ministers of God what they shall preach and teach, and what form of religion they shall follow.* And is not all your preaching and teaching, and the whole form and manner of all your religion now in England, enacted, established and set up by Parliament, by the lay magistrates only, the ministers of God, all the bishops and inferior clergy in the Convocation house utterly, but in vain, reclaiming against it?"<sup>1</sup>

Against Coke, Persons brought forward the opinion of the celebrated Lutheran theologian, Martin Chemnitz. "Thirdly," he writes, "he (Chemnitz) passeth over to give judgment in like manner, to the said Elector, about the religion held in England, and of Queen Elizabeth herself, and her title of supremacy, saying first that no good thing in religion was further to be expected from her; that she had used hardly the Protestants of Germany; that she saw and felt now a third sect rising up in the realm of Puritans, that hated both her and the other Calvinists that followed her, who were enemies in like manner to the Lutherans: So he. And then passing yet further he scoffed merrily that she being a woman had taken upon her to make ecclesiastical laws; Et quod fæmineo et a sæculo inaudito fastu se Papissam et caput Ecclesiae fecit; that with a womanly pride, never heard of in former ages, she had made herself a She-Pope and head of the Church. Thus Kemnitius. And mark that he saith 'a sæculo inaudito' that from the beginning of the world there was never any such thing heard of, either among Christians, Jews or Gentiles."<sup>2</sup>

There was, thus, considerable point in Stapleton's address to his opponent: "Speak, speak, Master Horne. Is not all that you do in matters of religion obtruded to priests and ministers by force of the temporal law? Answer then to Calvin's complaint. Answer to your brethren of Germany. Yea answer to Philip Melancthon,

<sup>1</sup> *Counterblast*, f. 508. In his *Fortresse of the Faith* (pp. 381, 382) he cites the passage from the preface to the seventh century in the original Latin of the Centuriators. Above, he is referring to the opposition of the Catholic bishops and of Convocation to the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. The Elizabethan religious settlement was essentially a lay settlement. That is one of the reasons, and the most fundamental, urged at the time against its legality. Cf. Bonner's plea *versus* Horne, 1564, Strype *Annals*, 1725, vol. I, p. 379. Cf. also the Bishop of Aquila to Philip II, 19 June, 1559, *Spanish Calendar*, p. 76; Dixon, *History of the Church in England*, Oxford, 1902, vol. V, p. 124, and vol. VI, p. 32 ff.; J. H. Pollen, S.J., *A Flaw in the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion*, *The Month*, October, 1902, pp. 428 ff.; and H. W. C. Davis, *Canon Law in England*, reprinted in J. R. Weaver's *Memoir of Davis*, p. 133.

<sup>2</sup> Persons, *An Answer to the Fifth Part of the Reportes*, pp. 88, 89. He is analysing and citing the epistle of Chemnitz to the Elector of Brandenburg. For the position of Luther himself, cf. J. W. Allen, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-34.

the pillar and anchorhold of the civil Lutherans, who saith also, that in the Interim made in Germany, *Potestas politica extra metas egressa est* : the civil power passed beyond her bounds : and addeth, *non sunt confundendae functiones* : the functions of both magistrates are not to be confounded.<sup>1</sup> Yea answer to Luther himself, the great grandsire of all your pedigree. He saith plainly : *Non est regum aut principum etiam veram doctrinam confirmare sed ei subijci et servire* : it belongeth not to kings or princes, so much to confirm the true doctrine, but to be subject and obey it. See you not how far Luther is from giving the supreme government in all ecclesiastical causes to princes ? Answer then to these M. Horne. These are no papists. They are your dear brethren : or if they are not, defy them that we may know, of what sect and company you are ? What ? Will you in matters of religion stand post alone ? Will you so rent and tear asunder the whole coat of Christ, the unity of his dear spouse, the Church, that you alone of England, contrary not only to all the Catholic Church, but also contrary to the chief Master of Geneva, John Calvin, contrary to the chief Master of the zealous Lutherans, Illiricus and his fellows (the Centuriators), contrary to the chief Master of the civil Lutherans, Philip Melancthon, yea and contrary to the father of them all, Martin Luther, briefly contrary to all sorts and sects of Protestants, you will, alone, you only, I say, and alone, defend this most barbarous paradox of Princes' supreme government in all ecclesiastical causes, all, as you say, without exception ? Sirs, if you list to stand alone against all and by oath to hale men to your singular paradox, not only to say with you, but also to swear that they think so in conscience, get you also a heaven alone, get you a God alone, get you a paradise alone."<sup>2</sup>

Stapleton's language is somewhat severe, though mild, indeed, for sixteenth century controversy ; but it must be remembered how intolerable as well as utterly ridiculous for Catholics was this doctrine of Elizabethan Supremacy with its accompanying oath, recognising 'the Queen's Highness supreme governor as well as in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal.' "To bring in these novelties," writes Allen, "many a hard shift is sought, God knoweth : and of all absurdities this paradox of the supremacy passeth, the Lutherans flatly controlling it in general, and Calvin himself with all the Puritans, at the least, much misliking and reprehending the first grant thereof to King Harry ; for it is all one to be head of the Church and to be the chief Governor in causes ecclesiastical. . . . Howsoever such give or deny the same to the prince, it is plain against all reason and nature, and that much more in a woman than a man, which is not capable thereof by her sex. It giveth power to the Queen to confer that to others (as to the priests and bishops, to

<sup>1</sup> Melancthon, in *Examine Ordinandorum*.

<sup>2</sup> *Counterblast*, ff. 508, 508v. Compare F. Bacon's advice to the Queen concerning the oath of supremacy, Somers, *Tracts*, vol. I, p. 165.



preach, minister the sacraments, have cure of souls and the like) which she neither hath nor can have, nor do herself. It giveth her that may neither preach, nor speak in public of matters of religion, to do that which is more, even to prescribe by herself or her deputies or laws authorised only by her, to the preachers what to preach, which way to worship, and serve God, how to minister the sacraments, to punish and deprive, teach and correct them, and generally to prescribe and appoint which way she will be governed in soul."<sup>1</sup> The oath he describes as "the very torment of all English consciences, not the Protestants believing it to be true; and of all true-Catholics, as before it was deemed in her father a layman, and in her brother, a child, very ridiculous; so now in herself, being a woman, is it accounted a thing most monstrous and unnatural and the very gap to bring any realm to the thralldom of all sects, heresy, paganism, Turcism or Atheism, that the Prince for the time by human frailty may be subject unto, all our religion, faith, worship, service and prayers, depending upon his sovereign determination; a thing that all nations have to take heed of by our pernicious example, for the redress of which pernicious absurdity so many of our said brethren so willingly have shed their blood."<sup>2</sup>

This singularity of ascribing supreme authority in ecclesiastical causes to a woman is well brought out by Persons. After showing from the Gospels and the Epistles the kind of government that was practised in the early Church, he proceeds: "and in all this there is no mention of woman; though there were many holy women among them, and one more high in God's favour than they all, as before has been said. Neither ever is it recorded, that afterward any Apostle, Father, Doctor, Council, Synod, School, University, Pope, Prince, Nation, Country, Commonwealth or private man in Christendom, did appoint, admit or allow any woman to be chief in spiritual matters, before the English Parliament in Queen Elizabeth's reign; nor can any Protestant in the world bring any one instance, example or memory recorded by man or woman, against this universal prescription that I have laid down."<sup>3</sup> It was a safe challenge that Persons made: it received no answer at the time, and has received none to this day; for no such example of a woman's supreme authority in ecclesiastical or spiritual causes before the time of Elizabeth can be shown. The utter singularity of it, a fact never mentioned by our historians, could hardly be more pronounced.

"Neither is it of any force," he urges, "to object (as some do) that a woman may be head in temporal affairs, as queens are, for

<sup>1</sup> W. Allen, *An Apologie and True Declaration*, 1581, f. 42 v. Compare the Revised Articles "put forth by the Queen's authority," and 13 Elizabeth, c. XII.

<sup>2</sup> W. Allen, *A Sincere and Modest Defence*, 1584 (1914 ed.) vol. 1. p. 17. Cf. also, vol. 11, pp. 127, 128 and Stapleton, *Counterblast* ff. 54 v and 417 v.

<sup>3</sup> Persons, *An Answer to the Fifth Part of Reportes*, 1606, p. 82.

that God has left this free to men, to dispense in the use of their natural privilege of superiority for temporal government, and to appoint women to govern them, for avoiding worse inconveniences, when there are no heirs—male to succeed, as before hath been said. But the matter is far different in spiritual government, which dependeth immediately of God himself, and was delivered by him to men and not to women; and so hath been continued, throughout all ages from Adam to our days, and under all laws, both of nature, Moses and Christ.<sup>1</sup> For in the law of nature, the first-born male among the Patriarchs was always the head of the family, both in temporal and spiritual matters, and consequently also priest. And in the law of Moses the said priesthood and presidency in spiritual matters, was annexed unto a tribe of men, and no woman admitted thereunto. And much more in the law of the Gospel as presently we shall declare; and so we may conclude that from Eve to Elizabeth there was never woman that was supreme concerning matters of religion before herself, so singular was she in this point.”<sup>2</sup>

This singularity of a woman possessing supreme jurisdiction in ecclesiastical or spiritual causes he drives home when discussing the Caudry case in that quippish manner which he adopted at times with effect. First he cites that portion of the Statute of Supremacy “by which it was enacted, that such jurisdiction ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power, hath hitherto been, or may lawfully be exercised, for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for the formation, order and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities within this realm, should for ever be united and annexed to the Imperial crown of this realm.” There follows then the section of the same statute, which empowered the queen to appoint High Commissions: “and that her Highness, her heirs and successors should have full power and authority by virtue of that Act, by letters patent under the great seal of England, to assign, nominate and authorise such persons (*being natural-born subjects*) as her Highness, her heirs or successors should think meet, to exercise and to execute, under her Highness, her heirs and successors, all manner of jurisdiction, privileges, and pre-eminences in any wise touching or concerning any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within this realm of England and Ireland. And to visit, reform, redress, order, correct and amend all such errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities whatsoever, which by any manner of spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority or jurisdiction can or may

<sup>1</sup> Earlier in the book Persons has shown the difference between the temporal power and the spiritual, and further that though all authority is from God, the temporal is so only mediately through the people to whom it is given, whereas the spiritual is immediately from God by his own “delivery thereof”: and that this is particularly true of the Christian dispensation in which all authority is derived from Christ, who gave it to his apostles and their successors. *Ibid.* 23-26.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 78, 79.

lawfully be reformed, ordered, corrected and amended, etc.”<sup>1</sup> “This was the ground,” runs Persons’s comment, “whereby both the Queen was indued, as you see, with all manner of ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction, and had authority given to her, to bestow the same upon others, without any other condition here expressed, but only that they should be *natural-born subjects*. So as if it had pleased her Majesty to have bestowed a Commission upon so many ladies of the court to visit some part of the clergy or laity, to redress their errors, heresies, abuses or other enormities ; or instead of the bishops named by her, she had thought good to nominate their wives high commissioners over them to reform, order, redress, correct or amend abuses, I see not by the words of the statute, why it had not been lawful ; for so much as there is no exception of sex therein. And as well might the Queen have made women her substitutes in this point, as this statute gave all power *in capite* to herself, being a woman. I would ask moreover, that whereas king Henry the Eighth, when he was made head of the Church, appointed for his Vicar-general *in spiritualibus*, the Lord Cromwell, that was a mere layman, and caused him to sit above all bishops in synods and councils about ecclesiastical affairs ; why his daughter, Queen Elizabeth, that had the same authority that he had, might not have appointed my Lady Cromwell, or any such other Lady of that sex whereof there were divers that professed good skill in divinity (at the beginning of her reign) for her Vicaress-General in ecclesiastical affairs. Nay why the feminine sex might not have conspired together to have put down men for a time, and to have taken the government of the Church upon themselves : making themselves the clergy, as their husbands were the laity. And truly albeit this may seem ridiculous ; yet I see not what in earnest can be answered hereunto, but only the novelty and indecency of the thing. For as for the lawfulness, according to Luther’s doctrine, that holdeth all people to be priests and capable of all spiritual functions both men and women, I see no great difficulty.<sup>2</sup> And as for the said inconveniences of novelty and indecency, there might seem to be as great or greater in giving ecclesiastical primacy to a woman, as to make another woman her substitute, or Vicaress-General. But we see the first done and therefore the second might have been done, if her Majesty had pleased.”<sup>3</sup>

However ridiculous this argument of Persons may seem, that the Queen might have appointed ladies to be High Commissioners in ecclesiastical affairs and one of them to be her Vicaress-General, legally and according to the wording of the statute it would appear unanswerable.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Persons, *Ibid.*, p. 48. Cf. 1 Elizabeth c. 1, 18, printed in Prothero, *Select Statutes*, pp. 5, 6.

<sup>2</sup> He refers in the margin to Luther’s *De abroganda Missa* and to his *De Captivitate Babylonica*.

<sup>3</sup> Persons, *ibid.* 48, 49.

<sup>4</sup> In many of her High Commissions, as a matter of fact, the majority of the commissioners were, if not women, at least laymen. As already pointed out, the Elizabethans

It may seem strange that for such a novel system a claim should have been made, and for three centuries should have continued to be made, of continuity with the past. For this false tradition, as the late Professor Holdsworth pointed out, two great professions have been responsible.<sup>1</sup> Referring to Henry VIII's Statute of Appeals with its manufactured history, which was repeated in the Elizabethan Act of Supremacy, he writes: "But in order to create the illusion that the new Anglican Church was indeed the same as the medieval church, it was necessary to prove the historical continuity of these two very different institutions. Obviously this could only be done by an historical argument. When this argument had been put forward in a statutory form (as in the Act of Supremacy) it became a good statutory root for the continuity and catholicity of this essentially modern institution. But a merely statutory title gave an obvious handle to its opponents, and could hardly be expected to satisfy its supporters. It is not therefore surprising that lawyers, theologians and ecclesiastical historians soon began from their different points of view, to amplify and illustrate this historical argument, in order to prove that it rested upon a solid basis of historical truth. Two great professions thus have had and still have a direct professional interest in maintaining this thesis. The lawyers are tied to it by their statute and cases, the ecclesiastics by their tradition and the authoritative declarations of their (i.e., the Anglican) church. Naturally therefore its truth is still believed and maintained by a long array of imposing names. It was not till the historian arose, who besides being the greatest historian of the century was both a consummate lawyer and a dissenter from the Anglican as well as from the other churches, that the historical character of Henry's (and Elizabeth's) theory was finally demonstrated."<sup>2</sup>

Proceeding, then, to state the points demonstrated by this lawyer and historian, F. W. Maitland, he continues: "In England as in other countries in Western Europe the supremacy of the Pope, and the binding force of Canon Law were fully recognised . . . The Canon Law recognised the Pope not only as supreme legislator, but also as supreme judge of the church, and as judge he possessed not merely appellate but also original jurisdiction. He could be called in by any litigant at any stage of the suit, and not merely the

settlement was essentially a lay settlement; a point which has not been sufficiently stressed by historians, but which was emphasised by the Catholic exiles. The established Church under Elizabeth became, in fact, another department of the State. Cf. J. W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 171-183.

<sup>1</sup> Treating of the Elizabethan Act of Supremacy, the Professor asserts: "The relations between Church and State were emphasised almost in the words of the preamble of Henry VIII's Statute of Appeals: and the historical argument as to the continuous independence of the church, hinted at in that preamble, was expanded and improved." Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, 4th ed. vol. 1, p. 596.

<sup>2</sup> He is referring to F. W. Maitland and his *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, 1898. Holdsworth, *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 590. Cf. also H. W. C. Davis, *England and Rome in the Middle Ages* and *Canon Law in England*, two articles reprinted in his memoir by J. R. Weaver.



judgments he pronounced but also any dicta he might be inclined to express had the force of law . . . In fact the Pope could and did to a large extent make himself the Universal Ordinary. He has, says Bracton, ordinary jurisdiction over all in things spiritual, as the King has ordinary jurisdiction over all in his realm in things temporal. It is clear from the books of practice in the Canon Law that, whenever any considerable sum was at stake in an action, the usual course was to 'impetrate' an original writ from Rome nominating papal delegates to hear the case. In the thirteenth century the number of English cases which came before the Pope was larger than from any other country in Europe."<sup>1</sup>

No doubt, in a broad sense, as Professor Holdsworth remarks in the above quotation, it is true that Maitland did finally demonstrate the worthlessness of this claim to continuity on the part of the Elizabethan Establishment; for Maitland attacked the question from new angles and by the authority of his learning forced the attention of students on the worthlessness of the claim. But it is certainly not true that such demonstration had never before been given. To maintain this would be to do an injustice to one of the Elizabethan Catholic exiles, who proved it conclusively against what was probably the first attempt of a lawyer to uphold the contrary and defend what Holdsworth terms the manufactured history of the Statute of Supremacy. It was not long after the death of Elizabeth that the celebrated but violently anti-Catholic lawyer, Sir Edward Coke, published the fifth part of his *Reports*, in the preface of which, led thereto by the discussion of the Caudry case, he endeavoured to prove that the supreme authority in causes ecclesiastical belonged to the crown by 'the ancient prerogative and law of England,' alleging in support of it various instances in the reigns of English sovereigns both before and after the Conquest. The Jesuit, Robert Persons, countered this work by his answer to the Fifth Part of the *Reportes*, in which he showed and showed conclusively that both before and after the Norman Conquest the supremacy of the Pope had been recognised in England, and that no English monarch since the conversion of the country to Christianity by Augustine and his fellow missionaries from Rome, had ever claimed supreme authority in ecclesiastical matters before Henry VIII. He refuted the examples alleged by Coke and brought a mass of evidence to support the papal claim. As he had not the law books at hand in Rome, he depended in his work to a great extent, though not exclusively, on historical but not strictly legal authorities, citing largely from the chronicles, of which he showed extensive knowledge.

Coke in his preface to the sixth part of his *Reports* replied with lofty disdain: "When I looked into the book ever expecting some answer in the matter, in the end I found the author utterly ignorant

<sup>1</sup> Holdsworth, *op. cit.* vol. I, pp. 582, 583. Cf. F. W. Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, c. III. It is no wonder that Henry VIII prohibited the study of Canon Law. Cf. *ibid.* p. 92.

(but exceeding bold, as commonly those qualities concur) in the laws of the realm, the only subject of the matter in hand : but could not find in all the book any authority out of the books of the common laws of the realm, Acts of Parliament, or any legal or judicial records, quoted or cited by him for the maintenance of his opinions or conceits : whereupon (as in justice I ought) I had judgment given for me, upon a nihil dicit, and therefore cannot make any replication."

This remark of Coke's was, in reality, a mere trick to save his face, and avoid the necessity of making a reply : and as his antagonist pointed out, not even Sir Edward's laws allowed him to be 'both judge and party' in his own case. Nor was the charge strictly true ; for though Persons had not at hand the law-books, he had quoted, as he was able effectively to show, several ancient laws, medieval statutes and charters. In any case Coke's reply was a foolish one ; for the evidence of the chroniclers and historians, the Venerable Bede among them, could not be thus summarily and airily dismissed. Nor did he reckon with Persons ; for the Jesuit before he again replied to Coke, had an English Catholic lawyer, to consult, or less probably himself consulted, the very law-books from which Coke cited, and particularly regarding the cases previously quoted by the Elizabethan lawyer. Thus Persons returned to the attack, well primed with his Pinson, Stanford, Brooke, Fitzherbert, Rastall, Plowden and the like, and his reply was crushing. He showed that in his use of these authorities Coke had inserted clauses of his own, omitted passages which told directly against his conclusion, and in other points had made false inferences or otherwise misconstrued his authors. So far were the law-books from supporting Coke's contention, that the supreme power in ecclesiastical causes belonged by the ancient prerogative and law of the realm to the crown, that they proved quite the contrary : that the supreme power was recognised as belonging to the Pope.<sup>1</sup>

Coke did not reply. No reply, indeed, was possible : his bluff, for bluff it was, had been called. Persons had shown conclusively that Supreme power in ecclesiastical causes had been recognised in the past history of England as belonging not to the crown but to the Pope. Continuity of the Elizabethan Establishment with the Church in England from the conversion of the country to Christianity, was even in this sense, a pure myth.

L. HICKS.

<sup>1</sup> Persons, *A Quiet and Sober Reckoning*, 1609, pp. 499-524. Cf. also his *Treatise Tending to Mitigation*, 1607, pp. 535 ff. He makes great play with the "nihil dicit" of Coke who had since become a judge, as well as with his statement in his Reports "that he had cited truly the very words and texts of the laws, resolutions, judgments, Acts of Parliament, all public and in print, without any inference, argument or amplification, quoting particularly the books, years, laws, chapters and other such like certain references as every man at his pleasure may see and read them." He makes no less merry with Coke's rather sententious remark in the preface to the sixth part : "that every man that writeth ought to be so careful of setting down truths, as if credit of his whole work consisted upon the certainty of every particular period." For a summary criticism of Coke's treatment of the supremacy and his use of authorities, cf. Finlayson's essay in his edition of Reeve's *History of English Law*, vol. III, pp. 202-206.

## PILGRIMS TO CANTERBURY

**A** PILGRIMAGE is primarily an exercise of piety. With a sacred object in view, the pilgrim naturally aims at sanctifying his travels by devotions. There is something very uplifting and soothing in partitioning the hours of a walking day into periods of meditation, rosary and other forms of prayer. The pilgrimage is not thereby rendered any the less pleasurable and companionable. Rather do the alternate periods of prayer, silence and conversation give to the whole undertaking an atmosphere of simple enjoyment. You learn to savour fundamental things—the beauties of sky, land and air, the refreshing effect of a glass of cold water, the beneficent effect on the body of just walking. The absence of modernities, such as the dreary morning papers and the enervating thrills of the evening papers, emphasise the value of elementary things. The lungs breathe the pure air to full effect, and the whole human frame seems to prosper, even though it suffers healthy physical fatigue by the end of the day. Sleep is profound and dreamless. In short, nothing would seem to benefit a man more than a week of good vigorous walking in the open air. With physical well-being the soul expands, shakes off its worries and frees itself from the wearisome conventions of modern life. For a good form of bodily and spiritual recreation, commit yourself to the care of Divine Providence for your daily needs, and follow the hundred miles of these ancient footpaths to the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury.

We owed to Mr. Hilaire Belloc's book "The Old Road" the idea of this pilgrimage. And in the course of it we came to owe great debts to many others for their kindness and hospitality in making it possible for us to carry it out.

The road we took is generally known as the Pilgrims' Way. It avoids main roads for the majority of its course, and it is part of the ancient trackway connecting the Continent with the south western mineral districts of England. After the twelfth century it was much used by pilgrims from the South and West to the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Those pilgrims who landed at Southampton would proceed to Winchester and thence along the ancient track up the Itchen valley to Farnham. A few miles to the north east of this town the road divides. One road ascends the Hog's Back and proceeds along the summit to Guildford. The other more ancient track passes along the southern face of the North Downs through Surrey and through most of Kent till it reaches the valley of the Stour. There the Pilgrims' Way diverges from the older road (which crosses the valley and goes past Brabourne and Stowting to the old seaports of Hythe and Lymme), and follows the southern

face of the hills on the north bank of the river to the ancient city of Canterbury. The 120 miles of this road between Winchester and Canterbury can be followed more or less easily—though not quite so easily as when Mr. Belloc traversed it in the early years of this century—on the official Ordnance maps.

Armed with these maps, ruck-sacks on our backs, stout sticks, iron rations, and fortified with Bishop King's hospitality and blessing, we started out from Winchester at 10.15 a.m. on the morning of Sunday, September, 7, 1947. The way lay through the Itchen water-meadows for two miles till it merged with the Winchester-Alton main road at King's Worthy church. Here we saw the Vicar assembling his flock for the late service. He gave us an enticing look, but we hurried on, following the main road through Martyr's Worthy and Itchen Abbas to Itchen Stoke, a distance of six miles. Crossing the Itchen by the old ferry we went up over the hill, passing the famous Tichborne water-cress beds, and mingled the welcome charms of the Cricketer's Arms with our sandwich lunch. At 2 p.m. we took the road to Bishop Sutton which led us past the local mental home, whose inmates seemed to recognise us as kindred spirits, for they eagerly beckoned to us to come and confer with them. However we resisted the temptation and passed on to Bishop Sutton where we had a dreary four or five miles of busy main road before us. One of my companions being an Irishman and the other a Scot, the tedium of this part of our journey was much allayed by an animated discussion on national characteristics. By the time we reached Alton—eighteen miles from Winchester—we had come to the conclusion that with a heavy pack a stretch of fourteen or fifteen miles marks the limit of a reasonable day's walk. We were very weary and our feet had begun to develop blisters. However by the devoted attention of the nuns with whom we stayed we repaired the damages, and a magnificent roast duck upon which we supped sent us to bed in fine good humour.

The second day of our pilgrimage led us into Surrey and into far more pleasant paths away from the hubbub of main roads. Having paid our farewell to the kind nuns and given a few words of encouragement to their pupils who were being taught, each on a separate sewing-machine, how to make pyjamas, we said our pilgrimage prayers and made our way along a delightful road subsidiary to but older than that which goes parallel along the top of the Hog's Back. It led us through Seale and Puttenham. Both these villages possess charming little churches and the road by them is leafy, undulating and full of pleasant twists and surprises. At Puttenham the road takes the form of a sandy path leading over Puttenham Heath where Queen Victoria once reviewed her troops, crosses the Guildford by-pass near Compton and dives into the woods near Limmerslease, once the home of G. F. Watts, artist and sculptor.



We could not stop to view the many tributes to his memory as we wished to make Shalford Ferry—the old crossing over the River Wey—by lunch-time. A mile from the ferry itself, however, the deep sand in which we trudged (the lane is well named Sandy Lane) and the demands of our appetite overcame us, so we settled down in a field to our modest midday repast. Reinvigorated and refreshed by copious draughts of water which, despite a large dog seemingly allergic to pilgrims, we secured from a near-by farm, we approached the ferry by that ancient pilgrim church, St. Catherine's Chapel. Hard by the ferry we passed another monument left by our medieval forerunners—the miraculous well whose water cured ophthalmic afflictions. When we reached the river brink, there lay the ferry at our feet, but alas—almost completely submerged and quite unserviceable. As we stood there we reflected whether we ought not to despise such obstacles and plunge into the river in clothes and pack, just as we were, trusting that St. Thomas or St. Christopher would see us through. Then, disappointed and revolving impious forms of vengeance, such as writing to *The Times* newspaper and the National Trust, we made our way into Guildford complaining to St. Thomas of our misfortune in missing the great beauty of Chantry Wood and St. Martha's Chapel. Thence we took more modern means of transport into the neighbourhood of Gomshall. Here we began to feel even more like pilgrims in distress, for nobody seemed at all willing to supply us with a cup of tea. At length by the persuasiveness of my Irish companion refreshment was secured. We then scaled the precipitous route leading us up the face of the Downs and so rejoined the old Pilgrims' Way. After more energetic climbing we reached our destination for the night and were warmly welcomed by some charming French nuns whose Reverend Mother, a great walker, insisted on shouldering one of our packs and walking round the convent with it on her back. It will not be easy to forget the kindness we received here nor the lovely air which made us sleep like logs in this beautiful spot on the very top of the Downs.

Next day, after Mass, breakfast, piano-playing and snapshots, the pilgrims duly recollected themselves and departed across Ranmore Common, down West Humble Lane (where the old pilgrims' chapel still stands), and thence to Dorking and the crossing of the River Mole. This third day was rather a disappointment. Orders had been given by the Convent Infirmarian that we were to have an easy day of it owing to one pilgrim having developed a boil on his neck and to another's digestion having insufficiently recovered from roast duck. So we had to omit the beautiful passage along the Downs from Dorking to Reigate. We rejoined the Pilgrims' Way near Godstone later that afternoon—a spot we shall not forget because it was here that we were jeered at by little boys, who, it must be hoped, did not know pilgrims when they saw them. We slept that

night just off the track at Marden Park—now re-named Roehampton Park—the new home of the Sacred Heart nuns' famous school in Roehampton Lane. We approached this dignified mansion with great trepidation and also with a certain amount of discomfort under foot, for the drive, over a mile long, was covered with potholes and loose flints—a state of things due not to the nuns or their pupils but to war-time military occupation. The building itself stands in a sort of bowl hollowed out of the top of the Downs, and apart from its great dignity we were struck by the appropriateness of such a place as a solemn protector of the great Catholic highway of the past which runs so near it.

As we came under the shadow of the house we espied the nuns at recreation not far away. Making sure that we were unobserved (later we found that our precautions had been quite useless), weary and untidy from our climb of 600 feet, we rang the bell and begged a night's shelter according to our usual procedure. The hospitable and gracious welcome we received enabled us to recover completely from our indispositions and to make next day, in a full march, the passage from Marden to Titsey and Chevening—this last being the estate of Lord Stanhope, just within the Kentish boundary, which 'enclosed' by Act of Parliament, a century or so ago, about a mile of the ancient track. Except in one part the Pilgrims' Way throughout Kent is easily followed, and it is the best preserved section of it. The ten or eleven miles we walked on this fourth day were full of interest and beauty. Running along the side of the Downs at the height of about 300 or 400 feet the path affords exquisite views of hills and villages lying to the south; while in the far distance eastwards appear the shadowy heights guarding the River Medway. And here the influence of archiepiscopal Canterbury begins to be felt. You pass St. Thomas's well at Otford, and the ruins of the two palaces of the archbishop at Otford and Wrotham. About here, too, in ancient days were fought great battles against Britain's enemies and invaders. Ancient burial places, Sarsen stones and other relics of antiquity lie just off the route.

Having rested at the Convent of the Holy Child, Coombe Bank, and received many tokens of an almost royal hospitality, we made on the fifth day the passage from Wrotham to Snodland. Our reflections on the antiquity of our surroundings were broken for a mile near Trottiscliffe by such notices as "Danger," "Keep Out," "Unexploded Bombs," but not even these modern enormities hindered us from a deep consciousness that we were treading where many Catholic pilgrims must have trod in the ages of Faith, and that we were in touch with the more distant prehistoric past. Our morning's walk came to an end just short of Snodland, near an early mediaeval chapel adjacent to Paddlesworth Farm. The farmer's wife—of our own Faith—most generously entertained us with apples and tea, and we promised to remember her to St. Thomas when

we got to Canterbury. Snodland, on the Medway, a grim little industrial town, we had no affection for. The ferryman though present, was not on duty, and even the persuasiveness of my Scottish companion failed to overcome his devotion to his off-duty hours. So we had to solace ourselves with an hour's meditation and rosary—sitting on the platform of the railway station—and, as we had done earlier at Shalford, miss a series of monuments vastly ancient and interesting, such as the twin church to Snodland's at Burham, Kits Coty House, the Countless Stones—countless, because however many times you count them you always reach a different total—and the White Horse Stone. We also greatly regretted missing the remains of Boxley Abbey where the famous Rood once stood.

Arrived in Maidstone we made our way past the high prison walls to our lodging for the night. Here further complications awaited us, for owing to a miscalculation we had difficulty in securing accommodation. We were fortunate, however, in obtaining beds in one of the class rooms of a convent school, and our kind hostesses allowed us to compensate them for their kindness by joining in Community Recreation during which they were submitted to an exhibition of Gaelic, selected poems in the Low Scottish dialect, and some folk-lore stories of Gloucestershire.

The next day, our sixth, we covered the thirteen miles between Maidstone and Ashford. We followed the track through Detling, Thornham and Hollingbourne. In the last place—once the home of the famous family of Colepeppers—we met a scion of the Kentish Drakes, who reminded us that Sir Francis Drake had been born and bred at Upchurch on the lower reaches of the Medway. In the afternoon we reached Lenham, examined the glories of the church and village, and thence made our way to Ashford, where in the little Catholic church on Barrow Hill we prayed to St. Thomas to see us safely to Canterbury next day.

Our seventh day, like all the others, was sunny and encouraging. At Eastwell Park, once the residence of the Duke of Edinburgh and the birthplace of Queen Marie of Rumania, we followed the track through the fields to Boughton Aluph church, then up over Soakham Down along a line of yews—the perpetual companions and indicators of our way—to the summit, where we took in the lovely southward view. Before us at our feet lay the Stour valley. In the centre stood Wye with its grand church and its college founded by Cardinal Kempe in the fifteenth century, now an agricultural college attached to London University. In the distance to the east the Downs continued their line past Brabourne to Hythe, and we could just see the clumps of trees adjoining Saltwood Castle where the murderers of St. Thomas put up the night before they rode into Canterbury to commit their fearful deed. Away to the West stood the two humps on which lie Rye and Winchelsea. Beyond we could see Fairlight, the hill which nestles round Hastings, and beyond that again, in the far distance,

we could just descry the noble South Downs jutting into the sea at Beachy Head.

Pondering this scene, and having eaten our bars of chocolate, we dived into the mysteries of Godmersham and Chilham. Here we wandered a little from our path and found ourselves trespassing in the private grounds of Chilham Castle. We were kindly treated however by the agent of the owner, Mr. Somerset de Chair, and were allowed to go through to the Woolpack Inn, where Madame Picard was awaiting us with her best French cuisine.

Then at three o'clock began our last six miles. For the first two of these the Pilgrims' Way has been lost, so we had to face the dreadful Maidstone-Canterbury main road with its week-end burden of traffic, fruit-pickers and hop-pickers. At Nickle (formerly Knockholt) Cottages, however, we found the track again and followed it up the hill to Chartham Hatch whence it led plain and straight through Howfield Wood to the ancient encampment of Bigberry. Here a lovely sight awaited us. We had already glimpsed the goal of our pilgrimage, grey and distant, through the trees of Godmersham and Chilham, but now it lay before us, clear and majestic, three miles away, its twin western towers surmounted by the great central Bell Harry Tower. This was the view that Erasmus once saw, and wrote of so delightedly. We wished that the golden angel on the top of Bell Harry which so appealed to him was still in its place. However the magic of this view so heartened and consoled us that, saying our rosary, we plunged forthwith into the thicket which here covers the track, and made our way down the slope the other side, under Harbledown (probably Chaucer's "Bob-up-and-down") and through the orchards, unheeding the inequalities of the ground and the noisome odour of the Bridge-Blean sewerage works. Up the hill again to the place where the windmill and mint once stood, and then down Mill Lane and Watling Street to St. Dunstan's. In St. Dunstan's church, in the Roper vault, lies the head of another St. Thomas, Chancellor of England under Henry VIII. We were not too tired to pay him our respects briefly, and we walked on through the crowded streets till we came to our goal. At 6.45 that evening, in the fading light, we entered the Cathedral just as we were, packs on back, and knelt to kiss the stone that marks the place where St. Thomas gave up his life in defence of the Church. We then went, hungry and thankful, to our lodgings for the night. We had walked for seven days, and had covered ninety out of the hundred and twenty miles from Winchester on foot. The next day—Sunday, September 14th—we joined the great Diocesan Pilgrimage organised by the Knights of St. Columba, numbering at least 4,000 participants, and led by the venerable figure of the Archbishop-Bishop of Southwark. And so ended our week's devotion to St. Thomas of Canterbury.

H. W. R. LILLIE.



## THE MEANING OF RELIGIOUS LIFE

THE perfection of man consists in charity, which is love of God for His own sake, and love of fellow-men, likewise for God's sake ; the second commandment, as Our Lord says (Matt, xxii, 39) is like unto the first, being contained in the first as its logical consequence. To understand, therefore, how perfect any individual truly is, we should have to know the intensity of his charity ; if we may apply material terms (as we inevitably must) to such spiritual matters, we should have to be able to measure the quantity or power of his love of God. It follows at once that no one class of human beings can claim to be more perfect than any other class. One class may be in a position to practise virtue more easily ; but charity cannot be confined or limited by outward circumstances ; the beggar, the convict, even the rich man (about whom Our Lord spoke so emphatically), may be more perfect than a truly fervent religious, and of course much more so than a lax one.

St. Thomas Aquinas has discussed the whole matter in the last eleven *quaestiones* of the *Secunda Secundae* of his *Summa Theologica* ; and the present paper aims at little beyond a faithful exposition of his view.<sup>1</sup> His perspective is not always, in some subject-matters, everything we could nowadays desire, a fact of which the most striking example is perhaps the absence even of a single article dealing explicitly with biblical inspiration as such. But there were doubts and disputes about the religious life and the religious orders in his day, more so than in our own, so that he was naturally led to treat the question fully and carefully, and his clear and orderly handling of the issues involved remains a beacon-light to all that follow after.

As usual, he builds up his treatise logically from first principles. In 184.1, he explains that the perfection of any being consists in its attaining its own proper end, which is its ultimate perfection : in so far as it is attaining it, a being is perfect. Now God Himself is the final end of man, and it is charity that unites man to Him : therefore a man is perfect according to the amount of charity in him.

An interesting point follows in 184.3, where the question is asked, whether perfection is to be found in the practice of the commandments, or of the counsels. The unwary might be inclined to answer, in the practice of the counsels ; but, as St. Thomas points out, the great commandment bids us love the Lord our God with all our heart, and the second is like unto the first, bidding us love our neighbour as ourselves. These are definitely commandments, and there can be no doubt that the second is contained in the first, which

<sup>1</sup> In what follows the first figure indicates the question and the second the article, always from the *Secunda Secundae*.

sums up all perfection. And so we must say that perfection consists in obeying this commandment. And if perfection consists in doing what is explicitly commanded, where do the counsels come in? In his answers to difficulties St. Thomas explains that the commandment can be fulfilled in various ways, and that a man is not breaking the commandment because he does not fulfil it in the best way; and he gives as an example that a man may refrain even from what is lawful, in order to be the freer to devote himself to the divine service.

The question is next raised (184.4) whether whoever is perfect is also in a state of perfection; whether, that is, the state of perfection is essentially the state of those who are perfect. This is answered in the negative, on the ground that some are in a state of perfection who entirely lack charity and grace, as is the case with bad bishops or religious; whence it appears that some are leading a perfect life who nevertheless are not in a state of perfection. The question thus arises what constitutes a religious state? The answer is given that a man is in a state of perfection who has bound himself for ever with some solemnity to the practice of perfection. There must be a true obligation if there is to be a truly permanent state; and there ought to be some solemnity in the manner in which the obligation is undertaken, as there is on other occasions when obligations are undertaken by men which are to bind them for ever. These obligations, as will be explained shortly, are the obligations of the vows.

Meanwhile we may notice at once (from 186.1) the significance of the name of "religious". Religion in its strict sense is a virtue whereby somebody does something for the service and worship of God; and therefore those are called religious *par excellence* who give themselves up entirely to the divine service, offering to God, as it were, a holocaust. Now the perfection of a man has already been said to consist in his cleaving entirely to God; accordingly religion is a state of perfection. The tendency to such perfection, however, is enough. When Our Lord said to the young man, "If thou wilt be perfect" (Matt. xix, 21), He did not mean to say that he would be perfect at once upon the renunciation of his worldly goods, but that from the day of his renunciation the contemplation of God would lead him on to all the virtues. Accordingly in religion not all are perfect, but there are the beginners and proficients as well.

We are now ready to come to the vows, and it will be enough for our purpose to consider 186.7 where religious perfection is shown to consist in three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. It is here that we have the root of the matter. St. Thomas offers three arguments, thus making the matter all the clearer, though there is a fundamental unity between the three.

The religious state may be considered in the first place as a tending to perfection, for which tendency it is necessary that a man remove

from himself whatever may hinder him from tending with his whole heart after God, for in doing this the perfection of charity consists. The first hindrance is the desire of external goods, which is countered by the vow of poverty; the second is the lust after sensual pleasures, among which those of a sexual kind have especial force, and are countered by the vow of chastity; the third is the disorder of the human will, which is countered by the vow of obedience.

Looking at the matter another way, we see that worldly anxieties press upon a man mainly in three respects. The vow of poverty quiets the soul from the worries attached to the management of external goods; the vow of chastity from the care of wife and children, and from kindred worries; the vow of obedience frees the soul from anxieties about the conduct of one's life, and the management of one's own acts, since by this vow a man submits himself to direction from another.

Finally, religious life is a holocaust, wherein one offers oneself whole and entire to Almighty God. In the first place there is the sacrifice of all external goods, the independent use of which is always entirely renounced, and usually in the solemn vow of poverty all ownership as well. In the second place the goods of the body are sacrificed, and this more especially by the vow of chastity, which is the renunciation of its chief pleasures. In the third place the sacrifice is pressed still further home and is made utterly complete by the vow of obedience, wherein (to put it so) the goods of the soul are offered to God: that is to say, a man makes an oblation to Him of his own will, which controls all the activities of his soul.

Thus the sacrifice is complete, and for the two preceding reasons also it is clear that the three vows essentially constitute the religious life. In the answer to the second difficulty proposed in the same article St. Thomas shows that all the other observances of religious life are directed to the practice of the three vows. The three vows therefore are not the monopoly of any special order or of any special kind of religious life, with any special kind of activity. They make up religious life as such, and are Our Lord's answer to the question "Wherein am I still lacking?" And if anyone ask Him such a question, he (or she) must be prepared to face such an answer. What precise form of activity had better be undertaken in religious life, what kind of order therefore had better be entered, is an ulterior question, requiring once more careful consideration.

The apostolate of the laity has developed greatly in modern times, and is doing admirable work, to which one can only wish further increase and success. It is indeed an apostolic work even in origin, since St. Paul explicitly contemplates a contribution from every member of the Mystical Body of Christ to the life of the whole, "the work of ministry" for which the saints (that is, the faithful) are to be perfected, part working in harmony with part (Ephes. iv.

12, 16). St. Francis of Sales may not unjustly be looked upon as the founder of the modern apostolate, though his plans were in part frustrated, and it was left to St. Vincent de Paul, for whom he had such high regard, to develop the work more effectively. Nevertheless, even apart from the essential ministry of priests, the lay apostle cannot usually take the place of the whole-time religious with equal success in the works to which the latter devote themselves. At the time of writing, the Apostolic Constitution *Provida Mater* has lately been published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (vol. 39, pp. 114-124), providing canonical regulations for secular institutes aiming at Christian perfection, and it appears wiser and more respectful not to discuss the matter further without a clearer understanding and fuller experience of the principles and practice envisaged by the Constitution.<sup>1</sup> Two points in it, however, may be noted safely at once. In the first place, it is recognized that there are activities more easily carried on by those who to a large extent live a life in closer contact with the world than that of religious of the older style; but in the second place, considerable emphasis is laid on the practice of the evangelical counsels, whether embraced by vow or promise. Such indeed is the character of the counsels, that even quite apart from vows anyone aiming at greater perfection must look to what he is prepared to do in regard of them, and how far he is prepared to go. The great obstacles to advance, the lust of the eyes and the lust of the flesh and the pride of life, will always be there, and must be vigorously overcome. A certain amount of vigour in overcoming them, of course, is necessary even to save one's soul.

A religious need not be raised to the immense dignity of the priesthood; evidently in point of dignity no mere religious, male or female, can be compared to the priest of God. This is so well recognized by religious themselves and all others that there is no need to insist upon it; it is enough to say that at the word of the priest Christ Himself descends upon our altars. Such a privilege is in itself an incentive to holiness; nevertheless, if we take the priesthood strictly in itself, it is not a means of perfection. Apart from positive ecclesiastical regulations, nothing is sinful in the priest that would not be sinful in the layman. St. Paul seems to have chosen good and reliable fathers of families for his priests and deacons; and I have been told (but have not been able to verify it) that such a course is still possible in parts of the East where there is no priest for a remote village.

The Catholic Church, however, greatly desires that her priests should be holy, and has taken many measures to that end. Throughout the Church the rule is that no priest may marry. In the West a tacit vow of chastity is annexed to the reception of the subdiaconate, after which marriage is invalid and sexual intercourse a sacrilege.

<sup>1</sup> An excellent article has appeared in the September number of the *Clergy Review* (1947) entitled, "The New Law for Secular Institutes," by the Rev. Lawrence L. McReavy, D.C.L., M.A., dealing mainly with the canonical aspect of the Apostolic Constitution.



In the oriental churches the general principle is that married clerics may become subdeacons, deacons and priests, though some of these churches have adopted the stricter Western practice; deacons, priests and bishops, however, cannot contract a valid marriage, and bishops must be single or widowers. The present article does not call for a further discussion of the matter, which may be sought in the late Father Thurston's article on the Celibacy of the Clergy in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, and in various books and other writings by Mr. Donald Attwater, the late Dr. Adrian Fortescue and others, on the Catholic and dissident Eastern churches. It must be enough to point out here (if it really needs to be pointed out), how much the faithful observance of the vow of chastity by the priests of the Latin rite can contribute to an advance towards perfection.

To obedience they are bound by promise; to poverty they are often bound by the circumstances of their life, in this age when the great benefices or their equivalents are largely a memory of the past. To these great helps the canon law adds the duty of regular retreats (Code, canon 126). All clerics should give an example to the laity by a holier inward and outward life (canon 124); and the bishops are to see that their clerics confess frequently, meditate daily, visit the Blessed Sacrament, recite the rosary, and examine their consciences (canon 125). Nevertheless, even if they have done all this from their youth, should they ask Our Blessed Lord what is still lacking to them, one cannot guarantee that they will not receive the invitation which He gave to the rich young man, to renounce all they have. Such a question has been asked before now, and has met with such a summons, which has not always been refused. And a very large number of religious, of course, have from the first contemplated the priesthood as a part of the Saviour's call to them.

As a function of their priesthood they have naturally contemplated in many cases the care of souls. So far as the law of the Church goes, indeed, there is no reason why religious should not be parish priests or bishops; many have actually become such, and the religious orders have also provided a number of popes. St. Thomas (188.6) raises the question whether a religious order which gives itself up to the contemplative life is better than one which gives itself up to the works of the active life; and he answers with a distinction. If the work of the active life flows from the fullness of contemplation, as in teaching and preaching, then this kind of active life is more perfect than the purely contemplative life, for, as he says, it is better to enlighten than merely to shine. But if the active life be one wholly taken up with external occupations, such as almsgiving, hospitality and the like, then it is less perfect than the purely contemplative life. Contemplation he has already explained (180.3) as prayer, reading and meditation; it does not necessarily imply the mystical state. In the purely contemplative life, solitude (188.8) is in itself more

perfect, when practised under proper conditions, but it is dangerous without some previous training in community life, apart from special graces.

In awarding the first place to those religious orders which are devoted to teaching and preaching, St. Thomas adds that it is these which come nearest to the perfection of bishops (188.6). Bishops as such are *perfectores*, perfecters of others, in virtue of their office : religious as such are *perfecti*, those perfected (184.7), or perhaps we might say better, *perficiendi*, those obliged to the quest of perfection in virtue of the obligation of their vows. Bishops on the other hand "oblige themselves to things which belong to perfection in assuming the pastoral office, to which it belongs that the pastor should lay down his life for his sheep, as is said in John X (184.5). This is a heroic act of charity, to which the bishop is held ; whence the distinction that he has the duty *exercendae perfectionis*, of practising perfection : whereas religious have that of seeking it, *quaerendae perfectionis* ; of which two duties the former evidently involves the greater perfection, so that the office of bishop, absolutely speaking and in itself, is a more perfect state than the religious state. It will be clear that St. Thomas is referring to the diocesan bishop ; nor does he apply his argument as it stands to those who work under the bishop, because the latter alone (184.8) obliges himself for his whole life to the care of souls, and has the chief care of his subjects.

If it be asked how the bishop is to secure this perfection, when he is not a religious, the answer of history is clear enough. Ultimately it depends largely upon the freedom of the Holy See in the appointment of bishops. Although the Holy See is rightly prepared to do much in order to have a working agreement with the civil power in matters wherein the latter shows a strong interest, it is also true that the Church has suffered much from the concessions which the Holy See has at times felt obliged to make as the lesser of two evils. It may be enough for our present purpose to instance Cardinal Wolsey, who contrived to gather into his own hands almost all power in Church and State, but always as the creature of Henry VIII, who thus found it easy to transfer all these powers to himself.

In the case of the larger religious orders and congregations, the practice of the Holy See is to exempt them from the control of diocesan bishops in what concerns their religious life and training, which is usually carried on under the control of a general at Rome, himself (or herself) subject of course to the control of the Holy See ; but the general principle remains that any external ministry is subject to the direction of the diocesan bishop. The Holy See has now issued several wise directions for the admission of subjects into such orders and congregations. This is the only point of importance in which the practice of the Church differs from the general principles laid down by St. Thomas, who was conforming his doctrine to the practice of

his time, which was to admit candidates to solemn vows (less easily dispensed than simple vows) after a single year of noviceship. He answers in the affirmative the question "whether it be praiseworthy for anyone to enter religion without advice from many and without long previous deliberation" (189.10). It may be enough to say here that the Code of Canon Law lays down a number of regulations dealing with the admission of candidates to the noviceship (canon, 542-552). At the end of their noviciate they must first take vows for three years only, before being finally admitted to perpetual vows (canon 574). (The Society of Jesus, which from its beginnings has had a two years' noviciate and a long training, has been specially exempted from this law.)

The essence of a vocation, to religion or to the priesthood, is to be found in fitness and a right intention. By fitness is meant, in the first place, physical fitness for the religious life, such as to warrant the confident hope that with reasonable care there will be sufficient physical strength to endure the training and life of the order without any bad breakdown; and in the second place, intellectual fitness, so far as it may be required for studies or other intellectual work; in the third place, moral fitness, which one may sum up roughly as a reasonably virtuous life and a tractable disposition, free from grave faults of character not sufficiently subdued. To such fitness and right intention is added finally the sanction of authority: it is the mind of the Church that only after fitting enquiry and trial should candidates be admitted to the religious life and the priesthood; after admission they are bound by her laws, so that the validity of their state no longer depends upon the estimate of their previous fitness and intention. They have not merely offered themselves; their holy mother the Church has accepted them, and has subjected them to the laws which govern their new state.

Indeed it is no small part of the holiness of the Church that she offers such a life to her children. Nevertheless they must not forget, what has been said at the beginning, that the perfection of man is charity, and that no state of itself guarantees such perfection: that each of us has to look to his own personal holiness in the state to which God has called him, seeking ever above all things to love God more and more, and his neighbour for God's sake.

C. LATTEY.

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### THE MARCHIONESS OF LAFAYETTE

(1634-1692)

DO many English and American people know that the greatest French female novelist, something like Jane Austen in English literature, was the great-great-aunt of Lafayette? Her masterpiece, *La Princesse de Clèves*, has just been re-edited with an historical introduction, critical notes and a glossary.

The Marchioness of Lafayette, by birth Mademoiselle Marie-Madeleine Pioche de la Vergne, was the daughter of the governor of Havre. She came from a half-Provençal, half Italian, family. She married the Marquis de Lafayette, a very wealthy grand seigneur, at the age of twenty-two, and so became the sister-in-law of Agnes de Lafayette who had a platonic love adventure with King Louis XIII, and who under the admonition and advice of her confessor, St. Vincent de Paul, instead of becoming the king's mistress entered a convent of Visitandines. The reconciliation between the king and his wife (also arranged by St. Vincent de Paul after that 'adventure') resulted in the birth of Louis XIV.

Mme de Lafayette's married life was a peaceful one. She had two sons; the elder became an officer, the younger a priest. She was highly cultured; like most great ladies of that time she knew theology, philosophy, Greek, Latin, Spanish, Italian, English. She was an aristocratic woman of letters, and counted among her friends the Duke of Larochehoucauld, the pessimistic author of the *Maxims*, the Marchioness of Sévigné, the most delightful talker and letter-writer that ever lived, the Marchioness of Coulanges, etc. She was a devout Christian with Jansenist tendencies.

*La Princesse de Clèves* is one of the finest French love-novels. Many connoisseurs rank it even higher than *Eugénie Grandet* or *Madame Bovary* for the delicacy of the feelings and the language, the sense of feminine virtue and faithfulness in marriage. Some would like to cut off one-fourth of it, the picture of the *galanterie* at the time of the French Renaissance; but that picture enhances the purity of Mme de Clèves.

The plot is very simple. Mme de Clèves, who does not love her husband passionately, is loved by the Duke of Nemours and feels, in spite of herself, attracted by that love. But wishing to be faithful to her husband she confesses to him the struggle going on in her heart. He becomes foolishly jealous and dies of jealousy. After her husband's death she meets again the Duke of Nemours, but does not marry him, being remorseful not to have loved her husband enough; and she gives up her broken life to austerities of devotion and charity. Of course the 'high lights' of the novel are the confession to the husband and the second meeting with the Duke of Nemours; they are sublime and heart-rending.

The source of the novel is historical. The Prince de Clèves was François de Lorraine; the princess his wife was courted by Jacques de Savoie, Duc de Nemours. But, historically, the Duchess of Lorraine, having become a widow, married her suitor. Mme de Lafayette has imagined a *dénouement* more conformable to the moral purity of her heroine.



The novel was written between 1672 and 1678, and published in March, 1678. Its success was immediate and immense; the confession episode was much discussed by women; many approved of it and many disapproved. A newspaper of the time, *Le Mercure Galant*, opened an inquiry about it among its readers, and there were thousands of contradictory answers. In September, 1678, there appeared an anonymous book of criticism about the *Princesse de Clèves* which has remained the best criticism of this novel. The anonymous critic does not like the *dénouement*, but he acknowledges that he has been *ému jusqu' aux larmes* by the confession episode, and that "one could not be more true and delicate in the portraying of love". Many people have supposed that the anonymous critic was a Jesuit, Father Bonhours, a well-known grammarian of the time. It did not prove to be so; the critic was a young writer, J. B. de Valincour, who became later on a member of the French Academy.

One source of the novel has been overlooked. It is, without any possible doubt, the story of Mme de Lafayette's sister-in-law; the very severe *dénouement*, too severe according to most readers, comes from that source.

What most strikes the modern reader in the *Princesse de Clèves* is not only the deep psychological insight into the heroine, divided between her heart and her duty, but also the purity of the feelings and the language; above all that belief in the sacredness of the marriage-bond which must not be broken, or even be soiled, by a thought or an impulse of rebellion. Mme de Lafayette was a Jansenist, and thought, wrongly, that literature ought not to be concerned with religion; yet *La Princesse de Clèves* is a profoundly, heroically, Christian novel.

PIERRE MESSIAEN.

#### A CONTEMPORARY DUTCH STIGMATICA

THE subject of stigmatization has been dealt with on several occasions in THE MONTH. Readers will remember various articles devoted to this phenomenon by the late Father Thurston. The last widely known stigmatica is Teresa Neumann of Konnersreuth (born 1898) who has been the occasion of bitter and wide-ranging controversies. There are, however, other stigmatized persons still alive or only recently deceased, amongst them the Italian Capuchin priest, Pio da Pietralcina (one of the very few cases of stigmatization in men), Anna Maria Goebel (1885-1941), of Germany, and the Dutch "Johanna G.", about whom there has been little publicity. An account of her case received from one of her spiritual guides, with an authorisation to communicate certain details, is the source of this paper.

Johanna was born in 1906, the daughter of a simple farm-worker. When 18 years old she began to expectorate blood casually. Her doctor made a diagnosis of tuberculosis. From this date she was confined to bed for four years. She was at times very ill, and once was believed to be dying. Her health was restored suddenly after a vision. Some time later a period of demoniacal attacks began. These lasted till February 1933. According to witnesses there were malodorous phenomena, frequently Johanna was lifted up and thrown against the wall by unseen forces, her body and bed-clothes showed the marks of burning heat. She also complained of a feeling as if her heart was burning, and a small metal crucifix laid upon her chest on these occasions became so hot that it was impossible

to touch it with the bare fingers. It is also stated that her chest expanded visibly on the left side. She vomited blood frequently (particularly during every June). She had several suppurating wounds. Sometimes her body would contract and roll up, sometimes it was stretched curvilinearly "like a bow", touching the bed only with head and heels. To these sufferings a sudden end came at Easter in 1940.

The first of her stigmata was a bleeding "wound" in the left side. This appeared in June 1931, after she had seen the vision of a radiant heart above the tabernacle in the church and had felt a piercing pain "like an arrow" in her side. This stigma emitted blood every Friday afterwards. On December 4, 1931, blood appeared running from her forehead. The stigmata of the hands developed on December 14, 1934. Later, on the left side of her chest, two "wounds" were to be seen, one cross-shaped, and below it another one in the shape of a lunula.

June 1931 also marked the beginning of Johanna's ecstasies in which she seemed to suffer the agonies of the Passion. The exterior picture of these ecstasies may have been similar to that shown by other famous stigmatic women (Veronica Giuliani, Anna Katharina Emmerick, Juliana Weisskirchen, Maria Baouardy, Louise Lateau, Clara Moes, Teresa Neumann): an expression of fearful anxiety, with signs of crushing pain and real agony, abundant bleeding from the forehead, the eyes, the mouth, and from all five stigmata. Unfortunately, there exists no precise description of Johanna's stigmata; so it remains possible that they were not true 'stigmata'—bleeding excoriations of the skin surface—but circumscribed haematidrotic spots, where the epidermis remains completely intact, as in many other cases of stigmatization.

At the very moment when the Germans occupied the village where Johanna lived, in May 1940, the entire stigmatization ceased abruptly, and till now the bleeding has not reappeared. The visions, however, continued. It has been alleged that Johanna disposes of televisionary, telekinetic, cardiognostic and hierognostic capacities; and also that she bears the 'mystical ring' (like other female mystics) which is only visible to herself and a few persons.

Now the sum of these phenomena does not exceed the usual 'picture' as it is well known to the historian of stigmatization. In fact, all the 'classic' elements of such cases will be found here: a long, enigmatic illness, and after years of suffering the sudden restoration of the patient to health, a period of 'daemonic assaults', finally mystical union, with the development of bleeding stigmata.

To consider some critical details: it is rather significant that Johanna suffered from tuberculosis, if this diagnosis is to be accepted, when she was a young girl. In any case there is evidence of blood coming frequently from an interior source in this early stage of her history. As for her large "wounds" it seems most likely that Johanna had so-called 'neurotic' gangrenous spots on her skin. This disease is characterized by skin eruptions, or ulcerations, the pathogenesis of which has been much discussed by dermatologists. Some of them ascribe it to artificial inducement by the patients themselves; but other authors have set up important arguments against this assumption, and believe it to be a spontaneous disease. It is not contested, however, that these skin eruptions will often be found on 'hysterical' patients. Of former stigmatics S. Rita of Cascia most probably had such a gangrenous (non-bleeding) spot on her forehead.

The convulsionary "bow" Johanna made of herself with her stiffened

body seems to be identical with the hysterical 'arc de cercle', as it was called by the nineteenth century neurologists. The stigmatic Elisabeth of Erkenrode (thirteenth century), Lucardis of Oberweimar (d. 1309) and Maria von Moerl (d. 1868) exhibited this symptom. Johanna is also said to live entirely without food; but it will be obvious that only by clinical observation can the truth of such statements be proved. The unilateral expanding of the chest, said to be due to a "dilation of the heart by mystical love", has been seen in famous mystics, e.g. Philip Neri and St. Maria Francesca delle Cinque Piaghe.

The path by which Johanna reached the stigmata and her ecstasies we are tempted to call 'normal'. It is important that, in this case, it was not less than three years after the beginning of the bleeding that the stigmata of the hands and the feet made their appearance; also that there were not one, but two, bleeding "wounds" on the side. It is also significant that blood poured from the eyes and the stomach during the ecstasies.

It looks as if this stigmatic confirms the observation which can be established for almost every case of stigmatization: that bleeding stigmata appear only in persons previously subject to 'haemorrhagic diathesis'—frequent haemorrhages from various 'non-stigmatic' regions of the skin (so-called 'haematidrosis'), and from the internal mucous surfaces of the body—a condition which develops on even slight emotional occasions. The story of Johanna G. also proves, once again, that there exists some connection between certain exterior phenomena occurring in some mystics and the condition called hysteria.

F. L. SCHLEYER.

---

#### SHORT NOTICE

During the first world war Dom R. H. Connolly of Downside made the momentous patristic discovery of the *Traditio apostolica* of Hippolytus, while other scholars on the Continent, in complete isolation from him, were working towards the same conclusions. During the last war he has brought off a similar feat, this time with the *De Sacramentis*, a work which he now vindicates for St. Ambrose in the *De Sacramentis, a work of St. Ambrose*. (Privately printed for the author, Downside Abbey, 2s. 6d.) This time again the same ground was being worked over by Fr. O. Faller, S.J., in the Innsbrück *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*. The impulse starting both investigations was the same, an article by Dom Germain Morin in 1938, where it was suggested that the *De Sacramentis* might be a stenographer's report of sermons by Ambrose, worked over by someone else. The next step was obviously to examine closely the text of *De Sacramentis* for its wording of Scripture quotations—which might be similar to what can be found in the known works of St. Ambrose—and for any other similarities of phrase. This Dom Connolly has done, with exactness and good judgment. It is interesting to see Fr. Faller and himself dealing with the same quotations. Fr. Faller is more complete in his collection and classification of texts but Dom Connolly shows a distinct superiority in his power of handling the texts he has selected. One may now safely conclude that the internal evidence for the Ambrosian authorship of the *De Sacramentis* is satisfactory, having been examined and approved by two such careful scholars in complete independence.

## II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES

The contents of the autumn **Dublin Review** are less all of a piece than those of the spring number (there are now three issues annually, the yearly subscriptions being 21s.). Variety, however, commends itself to many readers and this time the occurrence of two literary centenaries has helped to give occasion for it: the first centenary of Viola Meynell's birth, and the fourth of that of Miguel Cervantes. To each two articles are devoted, one of them being a reprint of the critique which G. K. Chesterton contributed to the 'Dublin' when Alice Meynell died. Another article which (the Editor considers in a short foreword) gives to this particular number the character of "a family magazine" presents, with some words of introduction by Sir Shane Leslie, 26 letters of Cardinal Vaughan written to Lady Herbert of Lea and not before published. Another new feature is the contribution of letters from or about foreign countries: one on post-war French literature by Henri Clouard, an American letter by Edward Littlejohn, and one on the Soviet Union as reflected in recent literature in the U.S.A. The preliminary page of notes on contributors is another excellent idea in the present number.

The possibility of a Definition of the doctrine, universally held by Catholics, of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin is engaging considerable space in Catholic periodicals, and it is interesting to learn from an article on this subject by Dom Thomas Rigby in the **Eastern Churches Quarterly** for July-September, that the 15th of August is a great festival in all the Oriental liturgies: "Byzantine, Jacobite, Coptic and Armenian commemorate it with no little splendour." For the West, St. Gregory of Tours (sixth century) is quoted in a passage which testifies to the general acceptance then as now of Our Lady's death, an idea which some supporters of the Definition are inclined to reject; for he writes of the body of Our Lady being taken to paradise "where now, reunited to the soul she enjoys eternal blessedness." Dom Rigby thinks that the only and sufficient argument for the truth of the doctrine is its universal acceptance by Catholics in all ages despite the "coolness" of many theologians, and he advances an opinion that it is already "an article of divine and Catholic faith, *ex magisterio ordinario*," and not merely *proximum fidei* as the textbooks usually state. In this number some 32 pages are given to the "Chronicle of Events" and nearly half of these relate to the Russian Orthodox church over the period 1946-47. There are a number of admirable illustrations in the current numbers, one of a fifteenth century ikon showing together the founders of Western and Eastern monasticism, St. Benedict and St. Basil.

The October **Irish Ecclesiastical Record** is a special number, occupied almost entirely by historical articles of much interest on "Irish Emigration and the Church Abroad," in commemoration of the famine of 1847 which though not the only one was a principal cause of the emigration. The resulting gains to the Church, which must be recognized by Catholics of all nationalities and not least the English, are set out in five articles, covering the United States, Canada, Australia, England and Scotland. "England" is by Professor Denis Gwynn, and deals more with the "social" than with the more important religious consequences of the emigration. The Canada article (by John B. O'Reilly, D.D.) gives a heart-rending



picture of the sufferings of the emigrants from the famine fever they brought with them and from other causes. The "Record" is to be congratulated on an excellent idea well carried out.

The purpose to devote itself mainly to theology and philosophy, with some space devoted to Benedictine history, is seen to be well under way in the autumn number of **The Downside Review**. An introductory article by Dom Iltyd Trethowan, the Editor, deplores an alleged current lack of interest in speculative theology, which he considers deplorable "unless we are to take the potentialities of revelation as actually realized, its implications all worked out by earlier ages (and this would be scarcely credible, even if there were no unsettled controversies). . . ." The substance of this paper was read to the Newman Association at Stonyhurst in August and had there, we have heard, a somewhat mixed reception. In the same number the Abbot of Downside examines three comparatively recent books on the New Testament, two of Anglican and of Non-conformist origin in England, and one by a Calvinist professor of Basle University which was published last year. Dom Butler finds that each of these writers (Sir Clement and Mr. Noel Davy in *The Riddle of the New Testament*, Professor C. H. Dodd in *The Parables of the Kingdom*, and Professor Oscar Cullmann in *Christus und die Zeit*), who all "adopt a thorough-going 'critical' method as regards the Synoptic gospels" tend to the conclusion that what points, in these gospels, to the divinity and eternity of their central Figure, cannot be the result of development and working-over, but must be an essential feature of their 'sources'; and that thus there can be seen in these studies "a most encouraging swing-back, in non-Catholic critical circles, towards a theory of Christian origins that would harmonize with . . . the Catholic faith." Under the title "Lesser Benedictine Groups in the British Isles" Lt.-Col. H. F. Chettle contributes the first instalment of an interesting account of the daughter houses in this country of certain Benedictine abbeys with special rules founded in Normandy, the Limousin and Burgundy during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The reviews in this number are of much interest, especially one of Dom B. Botte's *Hippolyte de Rome, la Tradition Apostolique*, by Dom Hugh Connolly.

The September and October numbers of **The Clergy Review** fully maintain the growing reputation of this journal. They contain as many as four articles of historical value relating to England, Scotland and Wales; we note in particular Fr. G. J. MacGillivray's demonstration (October) of the extremely flimsy foundations on which the attempt of Scottish Episcopalians to imitate Anglican claims of "continuity" must needs be based. Fr. Lawrence McReavy's account of the New Law for Secular Institutes (September), alluded to elsewhere in this number of **THE MONTH**, is timely and useful. To the October issue Fr. Sebastian Bullough, O.P., contributes a thoughtful and well-balanced article on translations of the Scriptures: on the whole it is a defence of paraphrase at least for certain purposes. "The Messiah: An Old Testament Meditation," by Fr. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., in the September number, suggests some thoughts derived from the names of Jesus and His Mother as borne by certain figures of the Old Testament.

---

# REVIEWS

## THE MYSTERY OF MYSTERIES<sup>1</sup>

WE begin our Christian life in the tremendous mystery of the Trinity and hope to fulfil it in the vision and love and life of the communion of its unity. It is a mystery constantly in our prayers : and yet it is a mystery incredibly little in our thoughts, a mystery "dont on ne parle plus que pour mémoire," in Fr. de Regnon's phrase.

Fr. Taymans d'Eypernon has written a book which should remedy not only our ignorance but our reluctance to think and speak of this ineffable mystery.

Our God is more than the deity to which philosophy leads us, a personal infinite nature. The Christian revelation is of three Persons who are God: we are quickened by a divine Spirit to cry "Abba" to our heavenly Father with the authentic accent of sons in the divine Son. While never for a moment losing sight of the definitions that safeguard the unity of nature and the community of the divine creative operation, Fr. Taymans has a most pertinent warning against the tendency to think that it is the nature that creates ; this is a tendency that would lead to personalising the nature as a fourth divine Person. Always it is the person that acts through the nature. And in the case of creation it is a work accomplished in perfect unity by three Persons.

If, Fr. Taymans argues, there can be nothing impersonal about God's works, one must find in the achievement of the universe the mark, so to speak, of God's personality : but this will be, in the operation of three divine Persons, to find something responding to that which constitutes the Persons, to the relations which at once unite and distinguish the Father and Son and Holy Spirit."

"L'Etre parfait est nécessairement société," Fr. Taymans remarks of the perfect community of the Trinity. And it is in human society that he most fascinatingly and illuminatingly explores the impress of the Trinity. "Toute la société est identiquement et dans son unité même plusieurs relations"—relations of giving and receiving, activity and passivity ; relation of cohesion and union : relations which are really distinct and yet identical with the entity they constitute. His chapters on the Divine Persons, on Person and Society, on the Divine Relations are pages of a mutual revelation, in which human society and human relations bring one to a new understanding of what seems most abstract and unseizable in the divine mystery ; and at the same time the divine mystery floods with a new light the human counterpart, revealing the real ideal of the relations of human love and life.

Fr. Taymans' is a book for a wide public : it is both theology and spiritual reading. Sometimes slight and of uneven depth, frequently

<sup>1</sup> (1) *Le Mystère Primordial : La Trinité dans sa vivante image*. Par Taymans d'Eypernon, Bruxelles : L'Edition Universelle. Pp. 189 pages. Price not stated. (2) *Le Saint Esprit en nous d'après les Pères Grecs*. Par Paul Galtier, S.J. Rome; the Gregorian University. Pp. 288. Price not stated.

<sup>2</sup> It is a pity that, in a book otherwise well stocked with apt illustrations, the example chosen for this most important consideration should so labour with the limp congenital to all comparisons.

provocative, always stimulating, it is all these in the chapter on the 'Divine Missions,' where he sketches our relations to the Trinity. This is a subject of immense importance in the theology of human holiness. Fr. Taymans' contribution, though the theologian may ask for further precisions and elucidations, will be gladly welcomed by those who, with Fr. Mersch and others before him, would see the human soul related by grace not just to God but to each of the three divine Persons.

Fr. Paul Galtier, whose name and works need no introduction in any country where theology is taught, has with thoroughness examined a particular aspect of the same question, our relation to the Holy Spirit. In a short introduction he examines and rejects the contentions of Petavius, Scheeben and de Regnon. Fr. Galtier's own view is familiar from his articles and such books as *L'habitation en nous des trois personnes* and *De SS. Trinitate in se et in nobis*. Here he passes in review the grand authors of the Greek tradition and finds in them no evidence for ascribing exclusively to any Person of the Trinity any operation in the human soul or any relationship from the human side. The usefulness of this book need not be stressed. For the theologian the texts are thickets for the cudgels of war; but the non-theologian can pluck red roses or white not for badge of battle but as tokens of the loveliness of the life to which God has lifted us.

H. P. L.

#### FRESH AIR ON SHAKESPEARE<sup>1</sup>

"THERE is a march of science," wrote Lamb dejectedly, "but who will beat the drums for its retreat?" Well, Shakespearian science, at any rate, has now been given a drum and a drummer and a drumming such as would have delighted the heart of Elia. The sound of it will also stir the hearts of schoolboys, for here they may find their enemies, the beastly commentators, drummed into absolute absurdity. Here, Verity, the minion of the S.C., a disgrace to an illustrious name in the annals of cricket, is shown for the peeper and botanizer that he is; here Bradley is taken down so many pegs that you are ashamed ever to have been awed by him; here Dover Wilson is fooled to the top of his pretty elevated bent. Arguing strictly according to Dover Wilson's principles, Mr. Bliss has clearly proved that William Shakespeare was a murderer. The only flaw I can find in a really brilliant demonstration is that Mr. Bliss (Yorick) and his friend Eugenius themselves seem to have fallen victims to the Wilsonian spell at an earlier page, when they work out on textual evidence the number of games Shakespeare must have been able to play. The burgundy that night must have been unusually potent. It was on the same disastrous night that the merry iconoclasts (who are in fact one magnificent person, scholar, poet, and great Christian humorist and humanist, aged eighty-two) fell so critically from grace as to speak about the *owls* of Iceland. One has a vision of Verity turning cartwheels and shouting hilariously, "Snakes, snakes, snakes! Every S.C. candidate knows it's *snakes*!"

The snakes bring us to Dr. Johnson who started their celebrity. Mr. Bliss, being a hater of humbug, is of course a lover of Johnson. His book might almost have been called, "Back to Johnson," for its purpose and achievement is to vindicate the judgment of that great monument of

<sup>1</sup> *The Real Shakespeare: A Counterblast to Commentators*. By William Bliss. London: Sidgwick and Jackson. Pp. xii, 308. 1947.

common-sense when he wrote the following lines: "Notes are often necessary, but they are necessary evils. Let him that is as yet unacquainted with Shakespeare and who desires to feel the highest pleasure that the drama can give, read every play from the first scene to the last, with utter negligence of all his commentators. When his fancy is once on the wing, let it not stoop at correction or explanation. When his attention is strongly engaged let it disdain alike to turn aside to the name of Theobald and of Pope. Let him read on through brightness and obscurity, through integrity and corruption; let him preserve his comprehension of the dialogue and his interest in the fable. And when the pleasures of novelty have ceased, let him attempt exactness and read the commentators." Rightly does Yorick exclaim: "By heaven! Eugenius, that conclusion should be printed in letters of fire on the title page of every *Shakespeare* published!" Ay, Sir, and on the title page of every New Testament published, too. It must not be thought that the book is merely an elaborate lark, like those biographies of Sherlock Holmes. At his wittiest, and he is very witty, Mr. Bliss is in deadly earnest, a plumed crusader, out to rescue the Bard from the hands of the infidels. The learning he brings to bear in the process would set up a hundred of the miserable commentators for life. He challenges all their card-houses and sends them flying on the wind. He raises serious doubts whether Shakespeare ever was an actor. He argues him a man practically acquainted with the world's seven seas. He thinks that he retained, down deep, the Catholic faith but was not a practising Catholic. His portrait of the real Shakespeare at the end is either the truth of the matter, or we shall never know the truth. It has the authenticity of a masterpiece by Velasquez.

J. B.

TOTALITARIAN CLIMATE<sup>1</sup>

"WHAT is wrong with the Germans?" Mr. T. H. Marshall recently discussed this question in a wireless programme. It is interesting to compare what he has to say—text in *The Listener*, August 21st—with the analysis made by such a thoughtful, honest German as Fr. Max Pribilla, S.J. Both are in general agreement about the defects in the German national character, but how much more probing is the German!

Fr. Pribilla dismisses the plea that National Socialism was the cause of the evils perpetrated by Germany in the last twelve years. The problem is not Hitler, but the capacity to be infected by Hitler: there is something in the German people which made National Socialism possible. What are these deeper causes which still remain with the Germans after the downfall of Hitler and his system? It is important to know this, both for Germany herself and for the rest of the world. The author considers three main defects in the national character. The first is political immaturity, which manifests itself in numerous ways. The Germans allow themselves to be persuaded by obviously lying propaganda; they fluctuate uncertainly about ends towards which they should work; they choose wrong means to their ends; they are stubborn of will, and think that consistency or firmness to principles; they imagine that differences of opinion can be settled more effectively by loudness of voice than by

<sup>1</sup> *Totalitarian Climate*. By Max Pribilla, S.J. Foreword by M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. Catholic Social Guild, Oxford. 48 pp., 1s.



strength of argument. As a result of this political immaturity they have twice in a generation roused the whole world against them. The second defect is cowardice, appearing under a variety of disguises. The German can be brave, but only under command; he can do a good job, but only within the framework of official orders. He must be subject to rules and regulations, and consequently, a sense of responsibility for his neighbour or the common good is stifled within him. The educational system has fostered this abdication of personal responsibility. Its evil results stood out when there was not enough men of character to prevent the usurpation of Hitler or, later, the disaster of war. Thirdly, their great defect is the lack of a sense of community. The German, when not obeying orders from above, is self-centred, egoist, heedless of the needs of the country, heedless of injustices committed upon others.

These three faults, argues Fr. Pribilla, would never have played such havoc if the spirit of Christianity had not been lacking. This, alas, was the case in Germany: "The civilisation of Germany, deeply rooted in Christianity, withered away with all its magnificent creative works because its very essence was denied, and those who should have defended it shrank from the sacrifices which alone could save it." The English reader will pause here and reflect. Totalitarian climate! The evils we have witnessed in Germany have grown up because there was a congenial climate. That climate is spreading—nay, has spread—to England. Have we got sufficient men of character and responsibility to defend the Christian traditions of England, men who will not shrink from the sacrifices which alone can save it? This book, I feel sure, has been published by the C.S.G. to set Englishmen upon a serious examination of conscience. May it give fresh energy to those already fighting the good fight and impel others to engage in the combat!

F. S.

---

### THE DESIRE TO SEE GOD<sup>1</sup>

"BEFORE I knew the history of the saints, I had a foreshadowing of their ecstasy. For the same truth had penetrated even into pagan philosophy: that it is a bliss within the reach of man to die to mortal needs, and live in the life of God as the Unseen Perfectness." When Romola's brother spoke thus to her in the accents of the nineteenth century he was oversimplifying a problem which has exercised many thinkers and many more who would not lay claim to that title. It is this problem which has given Fr. Bastable the subject of his book. How far can man be truly said to desire to see God with a natural desire? The problem was coming to the fore among theologians at the close of the nineteenth century, and after the interlude of Modernism it came, in 1924 and the years following, down to 1939, to hold the centre of the field. Ireland has already given us one thesis on the subject in the well-known work of Fr. James O'Mahony, O.S.F.C. (*The Desire of God in the Philosophy of St. Thomas*), and now it is not quite a case of Dublin correcting Cork—though in fact their conclusions do not agree—for Dr. Bastable's book is an historical inquiry rather than a simple analysis of the ideas of St. Thomas. That analysis is indeed given, but the conclusion is negative:

<sup>1</sup> *Desire for God*. By Patrick K. Bastable, M.A., Ph.D. London and Dublin: Burns, Oates. Pp. 178. Price, 12s. 6d. n. 1947.

"It is, I think, impossible to interpret St. Thomas' mind with certainty" (p. 45). There remains the wider problem of settling the truth of the matter, once the historical question of what St. Thomas taught is set aside, and here too Dr. Bastable uses an historical manner of treatment. A general survey (pp. 53-82) is given of Catholic thought on the problem ending with a convenient table, in which Rousselot and Maréchal are catalogued under the same heading as Scotus. After this, separate chapters are devoted to the analysis and criticism of Scotus, Suárez (mainly an attack on his notion of the soul's activity in the vision of God), John of St. Thomas, and the modern followers of Rousselot.

In his treatment of St. Thomas he decides (p. 36) that the *Contra Gentiles* is, in its first three books, a philosophical treatise. Admittedly the Moors, against whom it was to be used, would not accept the Christian idea of the beatific vision, but they were not unfamiliar with the idea of revelation and of God's taking a hand in His creation *motu proprio*. If their heaven was not the vision of God, that was only because the neo-Platonic thought of their guides, such as Avicenna, held it to be impossible for a soul to return to the One when its proper goal was union with the Mind or world-soul (which was the hypostasis next in order above the soul of man). The very aim of the book: "To manifest the truth which the Catholic faith professes", and the method indicated: "To bring arguments logical and worthy, some of them drawn from the books of the philosophers and of the saints", are an indication that one is not to expect that Augustine will be left aside until he can make a solemn entry in Book IV. If purely philosophical teachings of St. Thomas are wanted, the proper place to seek them is in the commentaries upon Aristotle, especially that which deals with the Nicomachean Ethics. It is strange that Dr. Bastable refers only once, apparently, to the Commentary on the Ethics, and then only as a supporting witness. If he had used it more fully, he might have been able to make more clear the picture he tries to draw of what natural beatitude meant to St. Thomas, and it would not have been necessary to depend so much on the description St. Thomas gives, or suggests, of the soul in Limbo as evidence for that natural state of happiness.

That God cannot, in the ordinary exercise of His power, allow a natural desire to be for ever unsatisfied is common Thomist philosophy. When sperm and ovum are united, God infuses the soul as a form which is the object of a natural desire on the part of that particle of matter. When man's soul has survived death, God refrains from annihilating it, so that its natural desire for contemplation may be satisfied. And so on. If then there is a strictly natural desire of the vision of God, it would seem that God ought to satisfy that too, and this would mean that God was no longer supremely free to give or withhold His graces. Hence later Thomists tried to modify the principle by saying either that the desire was not strictly natural (so Cajetan), or that it was not a desire but a velleity (so John of St. Thomas), or that it was not a desire to *see* God face to face (so Sylvester of Ferrara). Dr. Bastable will have none of Cajetan, and goes only part of the way with John of St. Thomas, and so logically he is left to make what he can of Sylvester. One finds that: "The beatitude natural to man is not perfect or essential beatitude, but an analogue of it", and that: "The object of human beatitude cannot be a particular finite good or the abstract good-in-general". One is left with the idea that natural beatitude is therefore the possession of God not in vision but in analogical knowledge. Yet Sylvester distinguished the vision of God as First Cause,

which he said was naturally desired, against the vision of God as Three in Persons, which was given to man freely by God. Thus Fr. Descocs, S.J., who in his *Mystère de notre élévation surnaturelle* tries to make something of this philosophical vision of the First Cause, is more nearly in the line of succession to Sylvester than Dr. Bastable with his natural happiness in the analogical knowledge of God.

What Dr. Bastable would have made of Fr. de Lubac's studies on the Supernatural, had they appeared in time to be used in his work, one can only surmise. Fr. de Lubac has proposed to stand the problem on its head to see if it will behave better thus. It is not, he would say, that we have any natural claim to the vision of God but that God has a claim on us, and it is impossible for man to escape from this claim of a jealous God. If we get this vision of God, it is not because our desires must be fulfilled, but because God's must. Copernican revolution, or Barthian somersault, or whatever it may be, this new statement of the problem will certainly set the discussion going again in new channels; and meanwhile Dr. Bastable's book gives a good summary of the state of the case (the only one in English) as it was before the new intervention. It should be mentioned that his book supposes in the reader a knowledge of Latin, as he leaves his texts in that language, but anyone interested in this problem should also be able to follow short extracts of medieval Latin.

J. H. C.

#### MIRACLE MANQUÉ<sup>1</sup>

THE book begins with the funeral of an East End priest, Fr. Malone, felt by his people to have been a Saint. In Chapter 2 we meet a holy but prudent Archbishop, and a zealous Monsignor, worldly without knowing it, who urges that this sort of 'cultus' must be stopped. We begin to fear that we shall be placed in the surroundings so perfectly described by Mr. Bruce Marshall—clergy cultured and uncouth, dutiful yet sceptic; and we feel that this cannot be improved on and need not be repeated. But this *motif* is not elaborated. Indeed, perhaps the book is slightly 'episodic'. The Monsignor gives a dinner in his magnificent country house which he calls his 'cottage' (is not that rather 'dated'?): we cannot believe in this, even as a caricature; but a guest, Cosma Fether-Preedham, enthusiastic member of a youth movement called 'the Flames', does suggest a caricature, though of what or whom, I am happily ignorant: but she appears no more. We like the book best when Miss Houselander gets right back among the variegated crowd that is in some way closely associated with Fr. Malone: as Martha, who would have rather died than that her unborn child should be killed. The child survived, but misshapen, yet radically 'converting' his father. Yet he was a sickly child, and still likely to die. In the end, they make him a sort of test case: Fr. Malone must work a miracle and save him. As a matter of fact, he does die: but the influence of the old priest has made itself felt owing to the novena which has brought so many and such different people into touch with him, better even than had he worked a miracle. Miss Houselander populates her pages very fully—newspaper reporters, Jews (described with unusual insight and sympathy), the Spaniard Fernandez and his sister and his

<sup>1</sup> *The Dry Wood*. A novel by Caryll Houselander. Sheed and Ward, 1947. 8s. 6d. net.

delinquent wife ; an unbelieving doctor ; a massive but mystical Portuguese lady ; nuns—above all, just the multitude of the very poor. One chapter that we like almost best is that in which "The Water of the Thames" flows through the soul of the kneeling priest. Many novels have been written about the poorest parts of London, some sensational or humorous, others drab, others meant to be fully sympathetic : but I cannot remember any that were shot through, as this one is, with the Catholic spirit, so that at last we get the true 'realism' : for where the spirit is lacking, the essential reality is lacking too. We could, of course, have trusted Miss Houselander to write with admirable artistry, and never to allow her book to become just an 'edifying' tale. We knew too that she could be kindly-caustic at due moments, and would be sensitive without being morbidly so. Therefore this book is a very satisfying one, and may well be a revelation even to Catholics who have looked, but have not seen ; or even, who have seen but have not understood.

C. C. M.

---

### SHORT NOTICES

The mere prospect of a **Retreat with St. Theresa** is inviting, and Dom P. J. Owen, O.S.B., has done a great service by his translation of this little volume from the original French work. Humility, Confidence, Patience and Simplicity, taught by the Holy Spirit, through the life and writings of the Carmelite Saint, may be said to be the theme of the Retreat. "Seek ye the old paths for that is the good way and walk ye in it" was the message of God to Israel through the prophets in a time of distress and perplexity. It is even more true and necessary to-day, when many are impatiently crying out and planning for 'new ways'. The Saint of Carmel walked firmly and securely, because she walked so patiently, humbly and trustfully in these ways of God. Men and women in the world to-day would be wiser and happier if they paid heed to her counsels and followed her guidance. (The Retreat is published by Douglas Organ, London, and costs 4s.)

Specialists will be grateful for the publication of some of the late R. A. L. Smith's papers. (**Collected Papers.** By R. A. L. Smith. With a memoir by David Knowles and a Foreword by the Master of Trinity. Longmans, Green and Co. pp. 128, 8s. 6d.) The book is of interest chiefly to the medievalist. Three papers are studies of 'English Monastic Finance' ; 'The Central Financial System of Christchurch, Canterbury' ; 'The Financial System of Rochester Cathedral Priory' ; and 'The Regimen Scaccarii in English Monasteries'. These, like the other papers, are the work of an accurate and lucid scholar, and are valuable for the light they throw on the state of the monasteries before the dissolution. Not unconnected with the papers mentioned is one on 'The Benedictine Contribution to English Agriculture'. This is of great interest ; for though justice has been done to Cistercian Agriculture, little has been written of the Benedictine, and we shall not have an accurate appreciation of the great part played by them in medieval English life unless we realise that even in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Benedictines took a prominent part in the agricultural development of the country. Of the



other papers in the book two are studies of Anglo-Norman prelates, 'John of Tours, Bishop of Bath, 1088-1122' and 'The Place of Gundulf in the Anglo-Norman Church'. They are a useful contribution to the still obscure history of the Anglo-Norman Church. Finally there are studies of Acton and Hallam. It is refreshing to see Acton described as a fanatical child of the Aufklärung, for while he was a great historian and a learned one it was this fanaticism which unbalanced his judgment. These able studies reveal what a loss the death of Professor Smith was to English Catholic scholarship. The pleasant memoir in this volume of a very gracious personality only serves to deepen that impression.

Professor van der Bruwaene gives us glimpses of Cicero as lawyer, politician, and philosopher in the four brief essays which make up **Études Sur Cicéron**. (By Martin van der Bruwaene. Brussels. Price not stated.) The first paper is concerned with the motives leading Cicero to restore to Terentia her dowry—motives in which the fear of legal action seems to find no place. The part played in Roman law by the praetor's edict is illustrated from Cicero's attack on Verres, and from his own conduct in Cilicia. The third essay considers Cicero's view of the part to be played by the Princeps if tranquillity is to be maintained at Rome. Even if Augustus was less influenced by Cicero's thought than Professor van der Bruwaene supposes, it is none the less interesting to see that the guardian of the ancient order is driven to consider his authority as a necessary feature of peaceful political life. The final essay compares the careers and political ideals of Cicero and Demosthenes, finding in them resemblances which extend to the technique of their oratory.

We think that Fr. O'Kane's booklet **A Catholic Looks at Life** (by Thomas J. O'Kane. (J. S. Burns, Glasgow: 63 pp. 1s.) might be put to two excellent uses. First, it would make a profitable meditation book for lay folk. Each page contains pregnant thoughts on the truths that really matter; and since these thoughts are here closely bound up with contemporary life, the layman can use them for personal applications which will point him the way to the heights of a virile and apostolic Christian life. Secondly, it would make a useful textbook for study circles. We have come across several groups asking advice on some fresh programme for their meetings. They say they have been through O'Kane's *Social Catechism* and Gordon's *Security, Freedom and Happiness*. (But I wonder if they have got everything out of these books!) What they want is a change. Well, we can recommend to them this latest work of Fr. O'Kane. Each member of the group might take one of the topics dealt with by the author and prepare a short talk on the subject. The style is so thought-provoking and so lively, that we are confident circles will not languish through dullness in their study of this volume.

The "Apostolate of the Sunday Mass" is responsible for three admirable volumes for the use of the clergy or the educated laity, written by Fr. E. C. Messenger, Ph.D., and published by Messrs. Sands and Co. We warmly recommend each in the series—**The Sunday Introits and Graduals**, **The Sunday Collects** and **The Sunday Epistles**. The text and explanations in each are clear and satisfying; at the same time thought, and even further research, is stimulated by a variety of rich suggestions. Archbishop Godfrey, the late Archbishop Goodier and Canon Arendzen contribute helpful introductions. The opinion upon one volume that "it is not a book to be read through at a sitting, or in a series of readings, as are ordinary spiritual books" is true of the rest. Indeed the three

form a unique liturgical reference library in themselves. We should like to congratulate the publishers on the production, and on the price, 8s. 6d. for each volume, in these exacting times.

Some three years ago Père Martin Jugie published an extensive study on the Assumption of Our Lady, in which he made much of the silence of the early centuries concerning this doctrine. A Franciscan theologian, Fr. C. Balić, replied with a thesis on the definability of the Assumption. Then in 1946, in volume 36 of the *Analecta Gregoriana*, Fr. O. Faller, S.J., dealt carefully with the objection raised from the fact of the silence of the first centuries. He points out that there is a likeness between the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and that of the Assumption, both of which are examples of the development of implicitly revealed truths. Moreover, he re-establishes the already well known evidence (the testimony of St. Andrew of Crete, for example) showing that P. Jugie's views do not impose themselves. The second part of the long essay shows how the silence of the earlier days is to be explained. The Assumption—the crown of the Marian dogmas—is bound up with the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption. Until their clearer elucidation was achieved the dogma of the Assumption remained not yet explicit. In the final section of his book, which occupies half his space, Fr. Faller deals with the unfolding of the doctrine of the Assumption implicit in five principles (listed on p. 127 and carefully discussed pp. 79 ff) unanimously agreed to by the Fathers of the Church, and this is a tradition which has run on from sub-apostolic times to the present day. Fr. Faller's monograph is obviously a thing for experts or at least for patient students: all however who read it will be grateful for its scholarly zeal, and for its courtesy and clarity in discussion with a fellow theologian.

---



---

#### EDITORIAL NOTE

All contributions submitted to the Editor must be typed and be accompanied by a sufficiently large stamped addressed envelope—stamps (or Post Office coupons from abroad) alone will not suffice. Articles so submitted should be concerned with matters of general interest, and be the fruit of expert knowledge or original research. They should not ordinarily exceed 4,000 words, and must be intended for exclusive publication in "The Month," if accepted.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review should be addressed to The Editor of "The Month," 114 Mount Street, London, W.1, and not to the Publishers: Business Communications to The Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton, London, S.W.15.

## "THE UNIVERSE"

The Leading Catholic Newspaper

merits your support.

It has faithfully and zealously served the Catholic Cause at home and abroad during the whole period of its long history 1860-1947. Its able editorials, Notes and Comments, powerful articles and unrivalled news service place it in the front rank of newspapers.

**EVERY FRIDAY 2d.**

Direct Subscriptions: 13s. Inland, or Abroad per year. Inclusive of postage.

Special terms for members of His Majesty's Forces: 10s. per year, inclusive of postage, and *pro rata* for 6 or 3 months.

Head Office:

Field House, Breams Buildings, London, E.C.4.

*Prices net, postage extra*

### PRACTICE OF PERFECTION AND CHRISTIAN VIRTUES

*By Father Alphonsus Rodriguez, S.J. Translated from the Original Spanish by Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J.*

Crown 8vo. Authorized English Edition complete in two volumes, 30s. per set; 16s. 6d. per single volume. Volume I.—Treatises i-xi, with portrait of author, pp. xviii + 878. Volume II.—Treatises xii-xxiv. With portrait of translator, pp. xvi + 688.

MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.

### MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR YOUTH

(SIXTIETH THOUSAND)

With the approbation of the  
Archbishop of Westminster and  
of the Archbishop-Bishop of  
Southwark.

This excellent prayer book, an especial favourite in Catholic Colleges and Convent Schools, was entirely re-arranged by the late Father Joseph Keating, S.J., in consultation with various spiritual Authorities. The manual has been described as truly manly and practical, and appeals to all whose piety is sincere, simple and devout.

Price, 4/- net cloth boards.

LONDON:

MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.15

## SWORD OF THE SPIRIT

*President;*

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL GRIFFIN

*Archbishop of Westminster.*

The **Sword of the Spirit** was established by Cardinal Hinsley in August, 1940

To unite Catholics in an understanding of the spiritual issues arising from the war;

To emphasize the need for Christian principles in social and international reconstruction;

To call upon Catholics for more sincere **Prayer**, for more serious **Study** of the Church's teaching on social and public questions, for more energetic **Action**.

The **Sword of the Spirit** Bulletin is published every month. Price 6d.

*Headquarters;*

12 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1.

## TRIBUTE

to a great work being done through members

*"May I take this opportunity of sincerely thanking the C.T.S. for helping a born Catholic to realise the tremendous privilege which God has given him."*

This one of many instances which could be quoted; one item from the vast collection of evidence to the value of a work which is calling for your support.

Write **TODAY** for details of membership.

**CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY**

38-40 Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1

## THE MONTH

EDITOR REV. JOHN MURRAY, S.J.

THE MONTH was founded in July, 1864, to represent the point of view and the claims of the Catholic Faith, and it has continued to do so for more than eighty-three years. The need to fight the battles of the Church in English-speaking lands—a cause to which the periodical is wholly consecrated—was never greater, and the Editor ventures to hope that the support given to his efforts may always continue and be extended.

PUBLISHERS Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., London.

Annual subscription 20s. post free (U.S.A. \$4.50) should be sent to the Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton London, S.W.15.

# THE DOWNSIDE REVIEW

A Quarterly of Theology, Metaphysics and Monastic History  
PUBLISHED BY THE BENEDICTINE MONKS OF DOWNSIDE ABBEY,  
STRATTON-ON-THE-FOSSE, NEAR BATH

AUTUMN : 1947

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| The Revival of Theology  | <i>The Editor</i>                                |
| The Doctrine of the Trinity and Apologetics  | <i>Dom Mark Pontifex</i>                         |
| Three Books on the New Testament   |  |
|  | <i>Dom Christopher Butler, Abbot of Downside</i> |
| Mr. Huxley, Mr. Allen, and St. Thomas Aquinas  |  |
|  | <i>Kenelm Foster, O.P.</i>                       |
| Studies in Traditional Anthropology I—Plato ( <i>continued</i> )   |  |
|  | <i>A. H. Armstrong</i>                           |
| Lesser Benedictine Groups in the British Isles   | <i>Lt.-Col. H. F. Chettle</i>                    |
| Book Reviews by Dom Hugh Connolly, Dr. E. C. Messenger, Dom Ralph Russell, L. C. Sheppard, etc.              |  |
| <b>The annual Subscription of 12/- is payable to the Review Secretary.<br/>(Single Copies 3/2 post free)</b> |  |

## Priest-Workman in Germany

BY HENRI PERRIN

10/6 net

When the occupying Germans conscripted hundreds of thousands of Frenchmen for slave labour in German munition factories, the French Hierarchy asked if they might send chaplains with them. The Germans refused. So a number of French priests had themselves trained as mechanics and volunteered to go as ordinary workers to the same factories. This is the story of one of them, a young Jesuit. It has already been translated into practically every European language.

## Sanctity Will Out

*An Essay on Joan of Arc*

BY GEORGES BERNANOS

6/- net

In a sense this book is a parallel to Bernard Shaw's picture of St. Joan ; but it is a Catholic parallel and quite different : Bernanos sees that Joan was a truer representative of the Catholic spirit than the official representatives of the Church who condemned her. Her story is unique : no other saint was ever canonised after a formal condemnation for heresy and witchcraft.

*Please order from your Bookseller*

## SHEED & WARD

### 110/111 Fleet Street, E.C.4